POLYEIDEIA

Hellenistic Culture and Society

General Editors: Anthony W. Bulloch, Erich S. Gruen, A. A. Long, and Andrew F. Stewart

I. *Alexander to Actium: The Historical Evolution of the Hellenistic Age,* by Peter Green

II. *Hellenism in the East: The Interaction of Greek and Non-Greek Civilizations from Syria to Central Asia after Alexander,* edited by Amélie Kuhrt and Susan Sherwin-White

III. *The Question of "Eclecticism": Studies in Later Greek Philosophy,* edited by J. M. Dillon and A. A. Long

IV. *Antigonos the One-Eyed and the Creation of the Hellenistic State,* by Richard A. Billows

V. *A History of Macedonia,* by R. Malcolm Errington, translated by Catherine Errington

VI. *Attic Letter-Cutters of 229 to 86 B.C.,* by Stephen V. Tracy

VII. *The Vanished Library: A Wonder of the Ancient World,* by Luciano Canfora

VIII. *Hellenistic Philosophy of Mind,* by Julia Annas

IX. *Hellenistic History and Culture,* edited by Peter Green

X. *The Best of the Argonauts: The Redefinition of the Epic Hero in Book One of Apollonius' Argonautica,* by James J. Clauss

XI. *Faces of Power: Alexander's Image and Hellenistic Politics,* by Andrew Stewart

XII. *Images and Ideologies: Self-definition in the Hellenistic World,* edited by A. W. Bulloch, E. S. Gruen, A. A. Long, and A. Stewart

XIII. *From Samarkhand to Sardis: A New Approach to the Seleucid Empire,* by Susan Sherwin-White and Amélie Kuhrt

XIV. *Regionalism and Change in the Economy of Independent Delos, 314–167 B.C.,* by Gary Reger

XV. *Hegemony to Empire: The Development of the Roman Imperium in the East from 148 to 62 B.C.,* by Robert Kallet-Marx

XVI. *Moral Vision in* The Histories *of Polybius,* by Arthur M. Eckstein

XVII. *The Hellenistic Settlements in Europe, the Islands, and Asia Minor,* by Getzel M. Cohen

XVIII. *Interstate Arbitrations in the Greek World, 337–90 B.C.,* by Sheila L. Ager

XIX. *Theocritus's Urban Mimes: Mobility, Gender, and Patronage,* by Joan B. Burton

XX. *Athenian Democracy in Transition: Attic Letter-Cutters of 340 to 290 B.C.,* by Stephen V. Tracy

XXI. *Pseudo-Hecataeus, "On the Jews": Legitimizing the Jewish Diaspora,* by Bezalel Bar-Kochva

XXII. *Asylia: Territorial Inviolability in the Hellenistic World,* by Kent J. Rigsby

XXIII. *The Cynics: The Cynic Movement in Antiquity and Its Legacy,* edited by R. Bracht Branham and Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé

XXIV. *The Politics of Plunder: Aitolians and Their* Koinon *in the Early Hellenistic Era, 279–217 B.C.,* by Joseph B. Scholten

XXV. *The Argonautika,* by Apollonios Rhodios, translated, with introduction, commentary, and glossary, by Peter Green

XXVI. *Hellenistic Constructs: Essays in Culture, History, and Historiography,* edited by Paul Cartledge, Peter Garnsey, and Erich Gruen

XXVII. *Josephus's Interpretation of the Bible,* by Louis H. Feldman

XXVIII. *Poetic Garlands: Hellenistic Epigrams in Context,* by Kathryn J. Gutzwiller

XXIX. *Religion in Hellenistic Athens,* by Jon D. Mikalson

XXX. *Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition,* by Erich S. Gruen

XXXI. *The Beginnings of Jewishness,* by Shaye D. Cohen

XXXII. *Thundering Zeus: The Making of Hellenistic Bactria,* by Frank L. Holt

XXXIII. *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora from Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE–117 CE),* by John M. G. Barclay

XXXIV. *From Pergamon to Sperlonga: Sculpture and Context,* edited by Nancy T. de Grummond and Brunilde Sismondo Ridgway

XXXV. *Polyeideia: The Iambi of Callimachus and the Archaic Iambic Tradition*, by Benjamin Acosta-Hughes

XXXVI. *Stoic Studies*, by A. A. Long

XXXVII. *Seeing Double: Intercultural Poetics in Ptolemaic Alexandria*, by Susan A. Stephens

XXXVIII. *Theocritus Encomium of Ptolemy Philadelphus*, by R. L. Hunter

XXXIX. *The Making of Fornication: Eros, Ethics, and Political Reform in Greek Philosophy and Early Christianity*, by Kathy L. Gaca

This page intentionally left blank

POLYEIDEIA

The *Iambi* of Callimachus and the Archaic Iambic Tradition

BENJAMIN ACOSTA-HUGHES

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS
Berkeley Los Angeles London

University of California Press
Berkeley and Los Angeles, California

University of California Press, Ltd.
London, England

© 2002 by the Regents of the University of California

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Acosta-Hughes, Benjamin, 1960–.
Polyeideia : the "Iambi" of Callimachus and the archaic Iambic tradition / Benjamin Acosta-Hughes.
p. cm.—(Hellenistic culture and society ; 35)
Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-520-220609 (cloth : alk. paper).

1. Callimachus, Iambi. 2. Iambic poetry, Greek—History and criticism. I. Title. II. Series.

PA3945.Z5 A36 2002

881'.01 21—dc21 00054496

Manufactured in the United States of America

11 10 09 08 07 06 05 04 03 02

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of ANSI/NISO Z39.48–1992 (R 1997) (Permanence of Paper).♾

FOR ERICH GRUEN

This page intentionally left blank

Contents

Acknowledgments *xi*

Abbreviations *xiii*

Author's Note *xv*

Introduction *1*

1. Callimachus and the Adaptation of Hipponax: *Iambus* 1 21
2. On Not Going to Ephesus: *Iambus* 13 60
3. The Elevated Paradigm: *Iambi* 12 and 1 (lines 32–77) 104
4. Fable: *Iambi* 2 and 4 152
5. Ethical Behavior: *Iambi* 3 and 5 205
6. The Statues: *Iambi* 6, 7, and 9 265

Select Bibliography *305*

Index of Passages Cited *317*

Greek Index *333*

General Index *343*

This page intentionally left blank

Acknowledgments

This book began in very different form as a doctoral dissertation that I wrote at the University of California, Berkeley and completed in 1995. Thanks are owed to my dissertation committee, especially to Mark Griffith for his generous advice and encouragement. A grant provided by the Graduate Division of the University of California enabled me to obtain photographs of all of the papyri of the *Iambi* and to have additional ultraviolet photographs taken of several of the folios of *P. Oxy.* 1011. Susan Stephens spent many hours giving me papyrological guidance, for which I am very grateful. From my time at Berkeley thanks are also due to Ronelle Alexander, Anthony Bulloch, Gian Biagio Conte, Marco Fantuzzi, Laura Gibbs, Andrew Kelly, Leslie Kurke, Sara Johnson, Donald Mastronarde, Dirk Obbink, and Thomas Rosenmeyer. Subsequently Luigi Battezzato, Giovan Battista D'Alessio, and Jay Reed read an early version of this study, and I am indebted to all three for their helpful commentary and criticism. Richard Hunter, David Leitao, and Susan Stephens read and commented on it in its final form, and I gratefully acknowledge my debt to them here. Peter Parsons kindly facilitated communication with several papyrologists on unpublished material on *P. Oxy.* 1011. I thank Anthony Bulloch, Revel Coles, John Gould, Jasper Griffin, Hugh Lloyd-Jones, Peter Parsons, and John Rea for permission to use their unpublished work and Ludwig Koenen for papyrological assistance. I would also like to express my gratitude to Kate Toll, acquisitions editor for the University of California Press, and to two anonymous readers for their suggestions. Dore Brown, Jennifer Eastman, and Cindy Fulton have been exemplary editors of a difficult manuscript. Robert Caldwell spent many hours proofreading the Greek texts. In the last stages of revision Timothy Allison worked as my editorial assistant, and my colleague Traianos Gagos gave advice on many points of detail. I have been very fortunate in the support and assistance of all who have aided

and advised me in the production of *Polyeideia*. Its faults are of course my own. For their constant patience and support I thank Jesús Acosta-Hughes, Renée Berger, and Mary Gray Hughes. This book would never have reached its present form without the unfailing counsel, encouragement, and occasional pressure of my mentor and friend Erich Gruen. To him it is gratefully dedicated.

Earlier versions of parts of chapters 1 and 2 appeared originally as an article: "Callimachus, Hipponax, and the Persona of the Iambographer," *MD* 37 (1996) 205–16.

Abbreviations

Standard abbreviations are used for collections and editions of texts, but the reader may find the following list helpful.

CA	J. U. Powell, ed. *Collectanea Alexandrina.* Oxford 1925.
Deg.	E. Degani, ed. *Hipponactis Testimonia et Fragmenta.* Stuttgart and Leipzig 1983, 1991.
FGrH	F. Jacoby, ed. *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker.* Berlin and Leiden 1923–58.
GP	J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles.* Oxford 1934, 1953.
G.-P.	A. S. F. Gow, D. L. Page, eds. *The Greek Anthology, Hellenistic Epigrams.* Cambridge 1965.
Gow	A. S. F. Gow, ed. *Theocritus.* 2 vols. Cambridge 1950, 1952.
Pf.	R. Pfeiffer, ed. *Callimachus.* 2 vols. Oxford 1949, 1953.
SH	*Supplementum Hellenisticum.* Berlin 1983.
W.	M. L. West, ed. *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum Cantati.* Oxford 1971–72, 1989–92.

This page intentionally left blank

Author's Note

The text of Callimachus' *Iambi* is taken from R. Pfeiffer's 1949–53 edition, with some supplementation. In reproducing Callimachus I have kept the lunate sigma, reflecting Pfeiffer's edition as well as the papyri. The text of Callimachus' epigrams cited in this study is that of Gow-Page; for consistency I have, however, used the lunate sigma in their reproduction. For all other Greek authors I have followed the conventions of standard editions.

I have cited the text of most Greek and Latin authors according to the relevant standard edition. In the case of Hipponax, I have given both West and Degani fragment numbers, thinking that many of my readers may be more familiar with the former. G. B. D'Alessio's *BUR* edition of Callimachus appeared in the course of this book's composition, and I have made considerable use of it.

All translations are my own with the exception of F. J. Nisetich's translation of Pindar *I.* 2.6–11. In the translations of the *Iambi,* I have retained very fragmentary Greek text that eludes English rendition, in order to give as close a representation of the original as possible. For the most part I have used Latinized spellings in transliterating Greek names.

I should note the omission in the bibliography of A. Kerkhecker's *Callimachus' Book of* Iambi (Oxford, 1999), which appeared after this book went to press. I was therefore unable to consult it in detail, although I have been able to check his texts. I incorporate two of his readings, *Iambus* 1.22 χὤcτιc and *Iambus* 12.19 εὐχῇ[c', ἐγ]ὼ δ'ἀείcομαι. I thank the editors of the University of California Press for their indulgence in this matter.

This page intentionally left blank

Introduction

I

The early Alexandrian period under the first three Ptolemies (ca. 300–221 B.C.E.) saw not only an awakened interest in the preservation and classification of earlier Greek poetry but also a desire to refashion, even reinvent, many centuries-old types of poetry in a new cultural and geographical setting. The poets of this period composed hymns, epinicians, and epigrams, to mention only a few genres, which, while often recalling earlier literary models through formal imitation and verbal allusion, at the same time exhibit marked variation and innovation, whether in the assembling of generic features, in disparities of tone, or in choice of theme or emphasis. This memorialization of earlier art forms calls attention both to the poetic models, their authors, and their artistic traditions, and also to the act of memorialization itself, the poet, and his own place in that same poetic tradition.

Some of these genres that the poets in early Ptolemaic Alexandria took up are known to have had a continuous life on the Greek mainland and elsewhere in the Greek-speaking world. Others had fallen into disuse already by the fifth century, but were now revived in Alexandria for a new audience, one of cosmopolitan nature and attached to a royal court and its institutions, including the *Mouseion*. Among these latter genres was *iambos,* a genre of stichic poetry recited to the *aulos* (oboe) and associated above all with Archilochus of Paros, Hipponax of Ephesus, and the cultural milieu of seventh- and sixth-century Ionia.[1]

Iambic poetry of the archaic period is a genre that demonstrates tremendous variation and thus defies narrow or easy demarcation.[2] In

1. On the problematic relationship of archaic iambic verse to Old Comedy see R. M. Rosen, *Old Comedy and the Iambographic Tradition* (Atlanta, 1988).

2. See M. L. West, *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus* (Berlin, 1974), 22–39.

very general terms, this is a type of poetic utterance at once ethical, in that it may serve as a medium for the criticism or shaming of another (*psogos* or "blame" poetry), and coarse or low, in that it embodies a realm wherein elements of diction, theme, or imagery that are normally excluded from more elevated poetic forms (e.g. elegy) are very much at home. And the speaker is often represented as being shameless and disreputable, or at least lowborn and socially marginal.[3] In Archilochus both of these characteristics occur in abundance. The language and imagery of his verse frequently evoke the low, the coarse, the graphically sexual. At the same time the underlying themes are often those that can be correctly defined as ethical, such as breaking of oaths or personal betrayal. Amidst the bawdy and the vulgar there is also moral commentary that often occurs in more elevated poetic forms with other diction and imagery.

Hipponax, the iambic poet who is in a variety of aspects the model for Callimachus in the *Iambi,* is not an easy figure to delineate through the surviving fragments of his verse. The father of the choliambic, or "limping" iambic line, Hipponax did not enjoy Archilochus' popularity even in antiquity, and he is usually represented in modern anthologies of Greek verse, whether in Greek or in translation, with a couple of the more complete and tamer fragments, if at all. The modern reader who seeks out the complete extant poetry of Hipponax observes a noticeable disparity between those fragments preserved by scholiasts and lexicographers and those which have appeared in papyrus caches. Much of the Hipponax preserved through citation are entries for unusual words or phrases, metrical qualities, or similar remarkable features, and the majority of these are quite short. The resulting impression is more than anything else esoteric, and this may well be a misleading assessment, as these particular few fragments were preserved precisely for their esoteric qualities. The papyrus fragments are at once tantalizing and frustrating; tantalizing for the image of vivid, almost mimelike action, varied persona, and colorful use of language, and frustrating for their very damaged state. These fragments reveal a more complex and more variegated iambic poet than the fragments that survive through indirect transmission might suggest. Broadly speaking, the generic features that characterize Archilochus as an iambic poet are also present in Hipponax, although often carried to greater extremes. These are (1) a poetic voice that is invective, didactic, or critical, and (2) language and imagery that evokes the petty, the low, even the sordid.

3. The ps.-Homeric poem the *Margites,* which Aristotle (*Poet.* 1448b24) sees as prototypically iambic, had as its central figure a character in many ways socially marginal.

These generic features of the archaic iambic poets are also observable among the Hellenistic iambographers, as in the ethical nature of the poetry of Phoenix and Cercidas, and in the choice of character and theme in the *Mimiambi* of Herodas. Yet the Hellenistic iambographers were composing iambic poetry not solely as an occasional oral utterance directed at the individual poet's *hetairoi* [peers] but for a self-consciously literate audience drawn from all over the known world to a huge metropolis in Egypt, far in both temporal and spatial distance from archaic Ionia.[4] And of all the Hellenistic iambic poetry that is now extant, none exhibits so great an awareness of this change, nor so takes advantage of its possibilities, as the *Iambi* of Callimachus.

II

Callimachus' *Iambi*[5] is a collection of poems in a variety of meters, all of which, however, would have been readily assigned in antiquity to collections of *iamboi*.[6] We know that these poems followed Callimachus' elegiac *Aetia* and that this order was one conceived by the poet himself, aware as he would have been as a compiler and scholar of archaic verse of the close if oppositional relationship of the two genres. Two papyri attest this order of composition. The first, *P. Oxy.* 1011, a fourth-century C.E. papyrus, is the most extensive source for these poems, which includes *Aetia* 3, 4, and *Iambi* 1–4, 12, and 13. The second is *P. Mil.* I 18 (the Milan Diegesis), a first- or second-century C.E. papyrus. This is a prose summary of the last two books of the *Aetia,* the *Iambi,* the four poems that follow the *Iambi,* and the *Hecale.* There is further the poet's own programmatic statement, the "epilogue" to the *Aetia* (fr. 112 Pf.).[7] Here he asserts (line 9) that he will now turn to a new poetic

4. The role that performance and the occasion of performance held for the composition of Hellenistic poetry has recently become a renewed subject of debate in the scholarship on Callimachus. A. Cameron's work, *Callimachus and His Critics* (Princeton, 1995), esp. chapters 1–3, assumes a greater role for performance than has been the traditional view. On the "literate" nature of the Hellenistic poet's audience see P. Bing, *The Well-Read Muse: Present and Past in Callimachus and the Hellenistic Poets* (Göttingen, 1988), chapters 1 and 2, and S. Goldhill, *The Poet's Voice: Essays on Poetics and Greek Literature* (Cambridge, 1991), chapters 4 and 5.

5. The references in the ancient lexica and scholia are generally either Καλλίμαχος ἐν χωλιάμβοις or Καλλίμαχος ἐν ἰάμβοις . The name ἴαμβοι may, as G. B. D'Alessio, *Callimaco Inni Epigrammi Frammenti* (Milan, 1996), 43–44 suggests, derive ultimately from Callimachus. *Iambus* 1.3 φέρων ἴαμβον οὐ μάχην ἰαείδοντα with its conceptualization of the genre may support this suggestion.

6. On *iamboi* and iambic meter see West (1974) 22.

7. The epilogue to *Aetia* 4, or most probably in the first edition, *Aetia* 2. The *Aetia* were in all probability reedited, quite possibly by the poet himself. Cf. Pfeiffer II xxxv–

form, αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ Μουσέων πεζὸν [ἔ]πειμι νομόν, [but I will go to the prosaic pasture of the Muses].

Callimachus' ordering *Aetia-Iambi* is informed by more than generic relationship and Ionic origin. There are many other features that characterize both the *Aetia* and the *Iambi,* features that the poet employs in both poetic types. Among these are varying modes of didactic voice, animal fable, memorialized statuary, programmatic statement, and *aitia* [origins or causes]. Further, Callimachus composes both the *Aetia* and the *Iambi* in careful contradistinction to earlier poets of the respective genres, and in both he defends his position as a modern and innovative artist in an inherited tradition.

We are thus on sure ground in assuming that the *Iambi* followed the *Aetia,* and in ascertaining the compositional features that mark both collections. Less certain is the exact number of poems that comprised the *Iambi.* Four poems (frr. 226–29 Pf.) appear between *Iambus* 13 and the *Hecale* in *P. Mil.* I 18, and the last of these (fr. 229 Pf.) is closely associated in the papyrus finds with the *Iambi.*[8] Pfeiffer calls these tentatively the μέλη, lyric poems. Whether these four poems belong to the *Iambi* is a subject of continuing debate, and considerable valid argumentation supports both sides of the issue. On careful consideration, I am inclined to believe the arguments in favor of a collection of the thirteen poems that Pfeiffer categorized as the *Iambi* to be convincing, if necessarily not conclusive given the state of our existing evidence. This study therefore assumes thirteen poems in the collection, that *Iambus* 13 (fr. 203 Pf.) is the final poem, and that its imagery of closure is meant to be final, not a point of transition to further works of the *Iambi.* The point is, however, a crucial one to an assessment of the collection, and for this reason I return to a detailed discussion of these four poems and the problems they pose at the conclusion of the comments on the thirteen *Iambi* that follow here.

These thirteen poems evolve metrically and thematically in a manner emblematic of Callimachus' own relationship with the traditions of archaic iambic. In meter, in theme, in voice, in setting, the poems enact a continual discourse with earlier models, reconfiguring a poetic past in a new setting. From the opening of *Iambus* 1, where a new Hip-

---

xxxvii, P.J. Parsons, "Callimachus: Victoria Berenices," *ZPE* 25 (1977): 48–50, P. E. Knox, "The Epilogue to the *Aetia,*" *GRBS* 26 (1985): 59–65 and "The Epilogue to the *Aetia:* An Epilogue," *ZPE* 96 (1993): 175–78. Recent treatments include Cameron (1995), 141–62, D'Alessio (1996) 37–40, 46–47, N. Krevans, *The Poet as Editor* (Princeton, forthcoming).

8. *PSI* 1216 + *P. Oxy.* 2171 + 2172 includes the end of *Iambi* 4, 5, and 6, the beginning of *Iambus* 7, several fragments of uncertain location, and fr. 229. See Pfeiffer II xi–xii for discussion, Cameron (1995) 169.

ponax is introduced as a speaking character, addressing a new, Alexandrian audience, to the last lines of *Iambus* 13 and the novel use of the image of sixth-century Ephesus, Hipponax' native city, as a negative paradigm, the *Iambi* of Callimachus maintain a constant and complex involvement with a poetic heritage, evolving through this heritage as a new emanation. As such these poems are quintessentially Alexandrian.

Iambi 1–7, 12, and 13 are preserved by papyri; 8–11 are short fragments supplied by the Diegeseis and by some other ancient sources. The poems are composed in a variety of meters, a variety, however, that is clearly not random. Callimachus composed the first four *Iambi* in choliambics, the meter that is associated especially with Hipponax. *Iambus* 5, the first of three epodic poems, is composed in choliambics alternating with iambic dimeter. The meter of *Iambi* 6 and 7 is alternating iambic trimeters and ithyphallics. Only one line of *Iambus* 8 is preserved, an iambic trimeter (we cannot be certain that this poem was not also epodic). *Iambus* 9 is in iambic trimeters. *Iambus* 10, and again the one preserved line of *Iambus* 8, are also in iambic trimeters. The meters of *Iambus* 11 and *Iambus* 12 are the more unusual, the one a brachycatalectic iambic trimeter, the other a catalectic trochaic trimeter. With *Iambus* 13 the poet returns to the choliambic trimeter of the first four poems, one of the significant grounds for seeing this as a poem of closure. As the *Iambi* exhibit a variety of meters, so they also exhibit a variety of dialects; *Iambi* 1–5, 8, 10, and 12–13 are composed in a literary Ionic, *Iambi* 6, 9, and 11 in a literary Doric, and *Iambus* 7 in a literary Doric with some Aeolic features.

Iambus 1 (fr. 191 Pf.) opens with a speaker, the voice of the archaic poet Hipponax journeyed from Hades to Alexandria, addressing an audience of querulous Alexandrians. As a paradigm for better collegial behavior he tells them the parable of Bathycles' cup, a parable from archaic Ionia and one that Hipponax himself appears to have narrated in some form. The extant lines of the poem close with a vivid series of Hipponactean images counterposed to contemporary Alexandrian ones.

Iambus 2 (fr. 192 Pf.) is likewise a poem addressed to a specific audience, here an acquaintance of the speaker, and likewise places an archaic narrative, here one of Aesop's fables, in a contemporary setting, a satirical assessment of other Alexandrian literati. Both poems, in different ways, use the mask of a figure of archaic Greece as a didactic medium to a contemporary Alexandrian audience.

In *Iambus* 3 (fr. 193 Pf.) there is also an evocation of past and present, here in lament for a time of a better morality unlike the present venal era, wherein the poet finds himself spurned by a mercenary youth

who prefers a rich companion. The poem, one of the shorter of the *Iambi* as we have them, concludes with an evocation of the poet's calling as at once the cause of his misfortune and his solace.

At the center of *Iambus* 4 (fr. 194 Pf.) is again a fable, here an extensive agon of two trees for place of honor and association with the divine. The fable of the trees' contest has its origins in narrative forms of the ancient Near East. Callimachus, however, uses fable here as a vehicle for a debate on poetic / aesthetic style, both elevating the narrative form to a new and contextually quite different level and defining his poetic art through this popular fable.

Iambus 5 (fr. 195 Pf.), like the third, censures another for sexual behavior, here a schoolteacher for taking advantage of his pupils. Like *Iambus* 1 this poem is also corrective, and also rewrites a certain amount of elevated poetic language and imagery into ethical iambic.

Iambus 6 (fr. 196 Pf.) is didactic in a different way. The poem is a self-consciously exact description of the chryselephantine statue of Zeus at Olympia presented to one about to journey there. Characteristic of most of the *Iambi* is the use of distant figures, times, and places. At the same time this is the first of three poems which evoke a distant work of plastic art.

Iambus 7 (fr. 197 Pf.) also centers on a journey and a statue of a divinity. Here, however, it is the statue that tells of its own journey to Ainos in Thrace. The narrative is a codicil to the world of grand epic, just as the statue is a πάρεργον [minor work] (line 3) of the maker of the Trojan Horse.

Iambus 8 (fr. 198 Pf.) is also concerned with heroic epic, here the Voyage of the Argo. This and the three short fragmentary poems which follow are all etiological, showing that Callimachus pursued the large theme of his elegiac *Aetia* here in a variety of meters, dialects, and poetic types (*Iambus* 8 is an epinician).

Iambus 9 (fr. 199 Pf.) is the third poem in the collection concerned with statuary, here with an ithyphallic statue of Hermes in a wrestling school that engages in dialogue with a passerby. Like *Iambi* 3 and 5 this is another poem with an ethical critique of sexual behavior.

Iambus 10 (fr. 200 a and b Pf.) is another etiological poem, this one concerned with the cult of Aphrodite Castnia in Pamphylia. This poem and *Iambus* 12, which opens with an invocation of Cretan Artemis, show another aspect of the memorializing character of the *Iambi* as a whole. The *Iambi* commemorate the temporally and spatially distant; poets, places, statues, religious cults. This is also a central purpose of the *Aetia*. Among the differences, however, is the absence of the structural frame that links the individual narratives or episodes of the *Aetia* as a

larger whole, and the variety of meters, dialects, and iambic features in which Callimachus is composing the *Iambi*.

Iambus 11 (fr. 201 Pf.) is another variation on a theme we encounter in the *Aetia*; the poetic conceit of the speaking tomb. In each poem there is an element of the generically appropriate. The tomb of Simonides (*Aetia* fr. 64 Pf.) and the victory over Scopas belong to the world of elevated poetry, the sacking of a brothel-keeper's goods in *Iambus* 11, to the world of iambic.

Iambus 12 (fr. 202 Pf.) is a birthday celebration piece, for which there are few parallels from earlier Greek or Hellenistic literature. This poem, like several of the earlier *Iambi* (1–4) and *Iambus* 13, is concerned with poetics, here with the eternal value of poetry. The poem has also an internal narrative, the tale of a divine birthday, which like the parable of *Iambus* 1 has a didactic purpose for the poet's contemporary age.

Iambus 13 marks a return to the choliambic line that the poet used for the first several *Iambi,* and also to the image of Hipponax, here in the allusion to Ephesus and Callimachus' statement on his own relationship to this poetic past. *Iambi* 1 and 13 share a number of significant features: the address to a critical audience, the association of the iambic poet with madness, the social misbehavior of the speaker's opponents, and categorization by genre. Particularly significant is the imagery of journeying through time. The speaker of *Iambus* 1 evokes his journey to the present with the opening verbal expression (line 1) ⌊οὐ γὰρ ἀλλ' ἥκω, the speaker of *Iambus* 13 closes (line 64) with his abnegation of a journey to the past with οὔτ' . . . ἐλιθώ⌋ν. The Diegesis to the latter poem informs us that it was here that Callimachus defended his use of *polyeideia* [poetic variation] in the composition of the *Iambi*. The diegete notes further that Callimachus had a model for his defense, the fifth-century Chian poet Ion. In *Iambus* 1 Hipponax functions as a valorizing force, so here Ion plays a similar role. And again the final lines of the poem return us to the sense of the journey to archaic Ionia with which *Iambus* 1 begins.

Underlying the thirteen poems as a collection are several organizational structures. It was once suggested that the overall structure of the *Iambi* was an architectonic one in the manner of Roman poetry books,[9] and certainly in several senses it prefigures these. Callimachus has organized the *Iambi* in a number of ways. One of these, as I out-

9. C. M. Dawson, "The *Iambi* of Callimachus: A Hellenistic Poet's Experimental Laboratory," *YCS* 11 (1950): 142–44, D. L. Clayman, *Callimachus' Iambi* (Leiden, 1980), 48–49. Cf. K. J. Gutzwiller, *Poetic Garlands: Hellenistic Epigrams in Context* (Berkeley, 1998), 187–88.

lined earlier, is metrical; another is dialect: the three statue poems (6, 7, and 9) are not in Ionic, but Doric. A third organizational structure is, broadly speaking, thematic. Separately placed are two poems with narratives of fable (2 and 4), two with critiques of sexual behavior (3 and 5), three that evoke statues and their histories (6, 7, and 9), and two (10 and 11) that include Aphrodite, one in a higher, one in a less elevated context. In the case of *Iambi* 6 and 7 the poems are paired, but are markedly differentiated by the voice of the opening line. *Iambus* 6 has a speaker who refers to the statue, in *Iambus* 7 the statue speaks the opening line. *Iambi* 8–11 are *aitia,* varying in meter, location, and tone. *Iambus* 11 is concerned with death, *Iambus* 12 with birth. Several of the *Iambi* (1–4, 12, and 13) are concerned in a variety of ways with Callimachean poetics. The manner in which Callimachus evokes poetry and poetic style is different in each of these poems. It does seem to be the case, however, even judging from the scant remains of several of the later *Iambi* and the comments of the Diegeseis, that poetics as a general theme frames the collection as a whole, as do the figures of the Muses and Apollo.

Callimachean scholars have used a number of terms to define this ordering. Puelma and Dawson speak of ποικιλία and *variatio,* Clayman of artistic organization.[10] Dawson and Clayman both see the ordering of the *Iambi* as one of concentric circles, one that prefigures the architectonic structure of Roman poetry books. Gutzwiller, while hesitating to accept so elaborate an organizational scheme, still calls attention to the separation of paired poems (as 2 and 4, 3 and 5) as an ordering device.[11] Yet the ordering seems more elaborate than a mere separation of paired poems. Juxtaposed poems are frequently complementary, the second of two poems following a tangential or different course suggested in the first. So Aesop and his reception by the Delphians figures in both *Iambi* 1 and 2, as does philological contention. The figure of Cybele and her noisy rites is a vivid feature of *Iambi* 3 and 4. *Iambi* 5 and 6, one a poem of admonition, one a send-off for a friend, differently employ the stance of advice and instruction. *Iambi* 6 and 7 contrast the statue spoken of and the speaking statue: one is the *chef d'oeuvre* of its maker, a chryselephantine masterwork, the other a minor work of a mythological craftsman, a simple wooden cult statue. Each of these poems involves a journey: *Iambus* 6 of the prospective viewer, *Iambus* 7 of the cult statue. *Iambi* 12 and 13 differently configure the

10. M. Puelma Piwonka, *Lucilius und Kallimachos* (Frankfurt am Main, 1949), 323, 335, Dawson (1950) 141, Clayman (1980) 48.

11. Gutzwiller (1998) 187.

relationship of poet and inspiring deity; in *Iambus* 12 the god becomes a poet, in *Iambus* 13 the god valorizes the poet's own voice.

The term *polyeideia* does not itself appear in the extant text of *Iambus* 13.[12] This is rather a characterization of the collection given by the diegete (Dieg. IX 33–36): Ἐν τούτῳ πρὸc τοὺc καταμεμφομέ | νουc αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῇ πολυειδείᾳ ὧν | γράφει ποιημάτων ἁπαντῶν φηcιν ὅτι | Ἴωνα μιμεῖται τὸν τραγικόν· [In this he says to those who fault him for the variety of the poems he writes that he is imitating Ion the tragic poet.] From the poem itself we know that Callimachus addresses at least two types of poetic differentiation, metrical (fr. 203 Pf. 17–18) and generic (fr. 203 Pf. 31–32), and there may well have been others.[13] Assuming *Iambus* 13 to be a poem that both brings closure to the collection and consciously comments on it, Callimachus' own conceptualization of the collection can be loosely defined as follows. The *Iambi* is a varied collection of poems (in form, meter, and dialect) which interweave the traditional and the innovative, the elevated and the low, and which all have some antecedents in an iambic tradition while at the same time refashioning and redefining that tradition.

III

The text of the Milan Diegesis includes four poems (frr. 226–29 Pf.) between *Iambus* 13 and the *Hecale*. They are not marked off in the text of the Diegesis with a separate collective title, nor any other indication that these comprise a separate collection of poems.[14] These poems are further associated in some papyri (*PSI* 1216 + *P. Oxy.* 2171 + 2172) again with the *Iambi*.[15] Pfeiffer tentatively entitles these poems the μέλη, following the indication in the *Suda* entry that Callimachus composed lyric poems (s.v. Καλλίμαχοc = Pfeiffer II xcv test. 1 line 12). This characterization of the four poems, however, is problematic; in particular none of the four poems is strophic. The perennial question surrounding these four poems is simply this: are they indeed a separate set of po-

12. On the term πολυείδεια see K. J. Gutzwiller, "The Evidence for Theocritean Poetry Books," *Theocritus,* ed. M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit, and G. C. Wakker (Groningen, 1996), 131–32. "The meaning of εἶδος that underlies this usage of πολυείδεια, then, is not 'poem' or 'song' but simply 'type', 'kind' with possible reference to any number of literary subdivisions."

13. Line 16 ἀρχαῖον εἴτ' ἀπαι.ι[. .].[may suggest a further differentiation of ancient and contemporary, one in keeping with the dichotomy of this poem and also of *Iambus* 1.

14. As the subscription that marks the end of the diegete's summary of the fourth book of the *Aetia* above Dieg. VI 1, Τῶν δ' Αἰτίων Καλλιμάχου διηγήcειc or the inscription to the Hecale Dieg. X 18 Ἑκάληc.

15. See Pfeiffer II xi–xii, Cameron (1995) 169, D'Alessio (1996) 44.

ems, or are they *Iambi* 14–17? This question is one which any modern reader of the *Iambi* must consider in assessing the place and character of *Iambus* 13, and the extent and character of the collection of poems as a whole.

It is customary in approaching this question to begin with the metrical and thematic issues raised by these poems (frr. 226–29 Pf.) and then to turn to the external evidence that favors considering these as the last poems of the *Iambi*. It may, however, be more constructive to reverse this process, as in some ways the arguments in favor of including these poems in the collection of *Iambi* are in part occasioned by the external evidence rather than supported by it. There are, of course, seventeen *Epodes* of Horace. While neither the number thirteen nor the number seventeen is aesthetically ideal in the eyes of some critics, it is nonetheless the case that were the *Iambi* of Callimachus to have included seventeen poems, Horace would have had a numerical model before him when he composed the *Epodes*. Some of the *Iambi* (5–7) are epodic, as is fr. 227, and Callimachus and Horace are writing in the same tradition, which looks back to the archaic iambic poets.

There are, however, some objections that might be raised here. While there is no question but that Horace is influenced by the *Iambi* of Callimachus, this seems far truer of the *Satires* than the *Epodes*. A careful reading of the *Epodes* and the extant texts of the *Iambi* fails to establish the sort of intertextual relationship that one would expect (this is not the case with the *Satires,* which exhibit extensive use of the *Iambi*).[16] Further, while some of the *Iambi* are epodic, this is not a collection of epodes as such. The relationship to Archilochus and Hipponax in the *Epodes* is clear, both when specified by the poet (cf. *Ep.* 6.11–14 *cave, cave: namque in malos asperrimus | parata tollo cornua | qualis Lycambae spretus infido gener | aut acer hostis Bupalo*) and more generally thematically. There is not, to reiterate, a similar relationship of these poems to the *Iambi* of Callimachus. It is, of course, perfectly possible, indeed very likely, that Horace had a model for the unusual number of the epodes. However, assuming the *Iambi* to have been this model, and on this ground assuming frr. 226–29 to be *Iambi* 14–17, is more circular a line of argumentation than it may at first appear.

Both metrical and thematic objections have been raised to including frr. 226–29 among the *Iambi;*[17] however, neither set of objections is in itself entirely convincing. The *Iambi* as a whole show marked metrical variation, indeed a certain metrical showmanship. As all of frr.

16. Cf., however, Clayman (1980) 75–81.
17. See Dawson (1950) 132–33, Clayman (1980) 52–54.

226–29 are composed in stichic meters,[18] the metrical character of the poems alone is not a convincing reason to exclude them from the *Iambi*.[19] Both *Iambus* 12 and fr. 228 (*The Deification of Arsinoe*) are occasional, both include divine and mortal. Thematically in some respects they are not unalike; a collection that includes one could in theory include the other. Fr. 227 (*Pannychis*) is hymnic in character, *Iambus* 8 is an epinician. Either in a collection of iambic poetry could be seen as transcending traditional boundaries of high and low form. Excluding frr. 226–29 from the *Iambi* on thematic grounds alone is, on closer consideration, rather problematic.

There is, further, a close thematic correspondence between *Iambus* 1, *Iambus* 4, and fr. 229 (*Branchus*) in the figures of the city of Miletus and the boy-prophet Branchus. Cameron has made a strong case for associating these poems together with Ptolemaic influence over the Ionian city–state in the 270s and 260s B.C.E., and he has argued that the thematic correspondence justifies including fr. 229 as *Iambus* 17.[20] Miletus itself figures elsewhere in Callimachus' extant work (*Hy.* 3.226, fr. 80.16). Callimachus' interest in Miletus in the *Iambi* may, however, have had as much a generic as political origin.[21] The city figures prominently in the fragments of Hipponax (frr. 27 W. [38 Deg.], 103 W. [106 Deg.]; cf. Anan. fr. 1 W. ([Hippon. 217 Sp. Deg.])). There is an additional thematic correspondence between *Iambus* 1 and fr. 228 (*The Deification of Arsinoe*) in the journeys of figures from Hades to the upper world, from earth to heaven, and through the heavens. These correspondences between poems are, of course, striking and significant in themselves; there are other such striking correspondences in the Callimachean corpus, such as those between *Hymn* 4 and *Iambus* 12. It is less certain that they necessarily justify including frr. 228 and 229 as further poems of the *Iambi*.

The crux of the problem is the close relationship, metrically, thematically, and intertextually, between *Iambi* 1 and 13. Both poems are concerned with Hipponax and sixth-century Ephesus, both are didactic, both are addressed to a critical audience. *Iambus* 1 opens with

18. Fr. 226 is phalaecean, which certainly Catullus understands as iambic in character (e.g. 36.5 *truces vibrare iambos*). Frr. 227–29 are metrically more unusual ("fourteen syllable Euripidean," archebulean, catalectic choriambic pentameter).

19. See Cameron (1995) 164–66, D'Alessio (1996) 45.

20. Cameron (1995) 167–68, 170–72.

21. Indeed, Miletus may serve as emblematic of Callimachus' overall relationship to archaic Ionia. His interest in and knowledge of Miletus effectively replace the need to journey to and be materially acquainted with the city that appears so frequently in his archaic forebear. I thank M. Fantuzzi for pointing this possibility out to me.

a Hipponactean figure traveled from Hades to contemporary Alexandria: *Iambus* 13 closes with the poet's abnegation of a journey to sixth-century Ephesus. It seems clear that *Iambi* 1 and 13 were conceived in these aspects as a pair. Not only are there the obvious thematic and programmatic parallels, but a striking number of verbal parallels in *Iambus* 13 recall *Iambus* 1. I discuss these in more detail in chapter 2, but give them here as well, as they are integral to this question. The one conjectured reading marked with an asterisk is my own.

Iambus 1 (fr. 191 Pf.)		*Iambus* 13 (fr. 203 Pf.)	
11	λαλάζων	17	λαλευc ι[. .] . . [
31	γρ|άφεcθε τὴν ῥῆcιν	24–25	ἡ ῥῆcιc | ἀκου[cτέα]*
33	ὦ λῷcτε	24	ὦ λῷcτ'
89	κονδύλῳ κ̣απηλεῦc̣[αι	27	ἀ̣πεμπολῇ κόψαc
91–92	[πέ]πλον	25–26	πέπλ[ον
	τὰc [Mo]ύ̣cac		τὰc Μούcαc

Another strong argument for considering *Iambus* 13 a poem of closure is the very subject of the poem. A critic charges that the poet transgresses generic boundaries of poetic composition, and the poet responds. The charges against the poet both as summarized by the diegete and as indicated in the poem itself (lines 17–18) look back to the previous poems and comment on the collection as a whole.[22]

It has been suggested to me that *Iambus* 13 could be a poem not of closure but of transition, and that the defense of the poet's *polyeideia* could be understood not as a conclusion to *Iambi* 1–13, but as an introduction to *"Iambi"* 14–17.[23] I would add to this suggestion that there is also the possibility of a poem that serves both functions, as *Aetia* fr. 112 *(The Epilogue)*. Callimachus' programmatic statement in lines 105–13 of the *Hymn to Apollo* provides something of a parallel as a programmatic work within a collection (here the *Hymns*).

The location of these four poems in the Milan Diegesis and the connections of the papyri do suggest that at an early date these poems were associated with the *Iambi*. One line of speculation that may here be the most helpful is one that considers the poet's own editing of his work. We are fairly sure that a number of Callimachus' poems that came to be included in the *Aetia* circulated at some point as separate poems,

22. Dieg. IX 33–35 Ἐν τούτῳ πρὸc τοὺc καταμεμφομέ | νουc αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῇ πολυειδείᾳ ὧν | γράφει ποιημάτων ἁπαντῶν [In this [he says] to those who fault him for the variety of poems he writes].

23. G. B. D'Alessio suggested this to me. Cf. Cameron (1995) 172–73, R. Hunter, "(B)ionic man: Callimachus' iambic programme," *PCPS* 43 (1997): 41.

for example, fr. 110 Pf. (*The Lock of Berenice*), *SH* 254–68 (*The Victory of Berenice*) and quite possibly frr. 67–75 Pf. (*Acontius and Cydippe*). Two of these are occasional court set pieces, as, of course, would have been fr. 228 (*The Deification of Arsinoe*). The following hypothesis may provide a resolution to the problem of frr. 226–29, and one that answers objections from both sides of the argument. *Iambi* 1–13 are the original collection (thus explaining the parallelism of 1 and 13 and the imagery of closure in 13). To these were added, quite possibly by the poet himself, or by a subsequent editor of his work, four poems that are not elegiac, not strophic, and in meters that, while remarkable, are not in and of themselves excluded from a broad conception of iambic. The collection and circulation in antiquity of both the *Idylls* of Theocritus[24] and the smaller speeches of Demosthenes provide a useful analogy here. It is then possible, as Clayman suggests, that a first-century B.C.E. Roman readership may have known a collection of seventeen poems.[25] The parallel of Vergil's knowledge of a collection of Theocritean bucolics that included [Theocr.] 8 as genuine is worth keeping in mind here. Whether and in what manner the *Iambi* were a model for Horace as he composed his *Epodes* remains, however, an open question.

This study assumes *Iambus* 13 to be the last poem of the *Iambi* as Callimachus originally conceived of the collection, while at the same time recognizing that the issue cannot be closed given the evidence we have. The Hipponactean frame of *Iambi* 1 and 13 is a structural feature at once integral and polyvalent, and sets a particular generic mark on a collection that is itself one of great generic variation.

IV

Most of what remains of Callimachus' *Iambi* is preserved in nine papyri. By far the largest of these is *P. Oxy.* 1011, a fourth-century C.E. papyrus now housed in the Bodleian Library, which preserves *Iambi* 1–4, 12, and 13. *P. Mil.* I 18, the Diegesis, preserves the lemmata to all the *Iambi* and gives brief prose summaries which include occasionally further citations from the text. In addition, *PSI* 1094 preserves scholia to *Iambus* 1 (c. lines 5–39) from which it is possible to supplement several parts of the text of this poem.

24. See Gutzwiller (1996) 119–48.

25. Clayman (1980) 54. No one to my knowledge has suggested that the inclusion of frr. 226–29 with the *Iambi* might have been influenced by Horace's seventeen epodes, in other words a structural influence in the reverse direction. As all the papyri concerned are from the first or second century C.E., this is not out of the question.

P. Oxy. 1011, while not an attractive papyrus, is not inordinately difficult to read. The papyrus does, however, need to be painstakingly reedited, and it is hoped that this task will be undertaken in the next few years. I have suggested a number of new readings of the text in my notes to individual poems.

The Diegesis provides a wealth of information, but it has certain inherent limitations. It is a summary, not a collection of scholia. In other words, the diegete does not (with a few exceptions) comment on the poem. The Diegesis (Lat. *narratio*) gives the first line and then certain chosen features of the content of each poem and in some respects is like modern student aids. In those cases where we can compare the Diegesis with extensive fragments, it is clear that the reader would gain a vague idea of the central theme and the names of some of its principals, but little of the actual nature of the poem. In a few cases where the description is rather detailed (e.g., to *Iambi* 1 and 7), what is usually at issue is a comparison of a narrative with other versions. *Iambus* 1, for example, includes a parable, the tale of the cup of Bathycles, which was well known and circulated in several versions. In general the diegete inclines toward simple, positively identifiable items, such as occasions, personal names, known fables. The Diegesis may be used to shed light on problematic areas of interpretation in the text, and it is an invaluable witness to some difficult readings. It also cites passages occasionally, and in some cases these citations are critical attestations to lost text. At the same time, an interpretation of Callimachus cannot be based, or only with great caution, solely on the Diegesis.[26]

V

The standard edition of the *Iambi* remains Rudolf Pfeiffer's monumental 1949–53 Oxford edition of the complete works of Callimachus (reprinted 1968). The *Iambi* have not been as fortunate as other works of Callimachus in the discovery of new papyri. An important exception is *P. Mich.* inv. 4967, which greatly supplements the text of lines 57–70 of *Iambus* 12 (fr. 202 Pf.). Pfeiffer treats this papyrus in his *Addenda* II 118–19. The presentation of the poems in recent editions and in translation has been problematic. Trypanis' 1958 Loeb edition, and

26. A similar situation exists with the prose letters of Aristaenetus (1.10 and 1.15), which take their subjects from popular erotic episodes in Callimachus. Absent in Aristaenetus are in particular the *aitia,* but also all else incidental to the erotic narrative. It would be almost impossible, as indeed scholarly efforts in the last century demonstrated, to reconstruct the Callimachean versions from Aristaenetus.

the majority of translations have attempted to facilitate a reading of often fragmentary texts by including only complete or semicomplete lines. Such large-scale omission has inadvertently done the student of Callimachus a considerable disservice. This situation has recently been greatly ameliorated by the appearance of G. B. D'Alessio's excellent annotated 1996 *BUR* edition with facing Italian translation of all of Callimachus now extant. His edition includes the fragments hitherto accessible only in the *Supplementum Hellenisticum.*

Interpretive studies of the *Iambi* in English have been few. No detailed study of these poems has appeared since D. Clayman's very useful 1980 monograph, *Callimachus' Iambi.* Dawson's 1950 study of the *Iambi,* while essential and often suggestive, suffers from not being based on Pfeiffer's text. Further, while there is much of great value in his commentaries, the freedom with which he supplements missing texts seems incautious today. Several of his central tenets on the composition of the *Iambi* have now been largely rejected.

At a time when there is a renewed interest in this Hellenistic poet from many angles, there is a real need for an interpretive text of these fragmentary poems with which the modern reader of Callimachus can engage, one that can serve as an aid to an appreciation of these poems, help to place the *Iambi* in their poetic and cultural tradition, and provide an impetus for further research and interpretation. My study is intended to serve that need. I have tried to make these poems more accessible and to highlight some of the jewels of humor, irony, and deftness of artistry that they contain. This goal has informed both the structure of the work and the choice of material for explication.

This book is neither a full-scale commentary nor a purely thematic treatment of the poems. While there is without question a pressing need for a comprehensive commentary to all of the *Iambi,* as well as fragments 226–29 Pf., I have not undertaken this task at the present time. The papyri that provide the majority of our texts need extensive reediting. These papyri are suffering from the passage of time. Some are in considerably worse shape than when R. Pfeiffer read them. Whether computer digitalization will improve our ability to read them remains only a hopeful expectation. A comprehensive commentary is best undertaken when such a reedition has been completed. Yet there is need for a new treatment of the poems now. For these reasons I have chosen a format that offers both extensive interpretation and notes that are intended to clarify points in the text, but by no means to be exhaustive.

At the same time this book does not provide a full-scale thematic study of the *Iambi.* This is not a study that is based upon but detached

from the primary text. Hellenistic poetry has seen a great expansion in interpretive studies in the last decade, and an area of Greek studies that at one time was characterized by a remarkable paucity of secondary literature is now steadily enriched by scholars following a variety of critical approaches. While there is certainly a wide area of possibility for such works treating the *Iambi* and other Hellenistic iambography, the fragmentary nature of the texts of the *Iambi,* and the selective nature of the commentaries we do have, require instead a rather different approach.

My study is a connected series of close readings of the *Iambi* that seeks two ends. The first is to explicate the texts as we have them, to suggest ways of reading often fragmentary and oblique lines, and to offer detailed notes where these will elucidate Callimachus' poetry. The second is to assess Callimachus' appreciation of and response to an earlier iambic tradition, particularly Hipponax, and Callimachus' perception of himself at once within and yet reforming that tradition.

Hellenistic poetry in general has suffered in Classical scholarship from its position between two preferred literatures. It is usually seen as either "late Greek" or "pre-Roman," and denied the opportunity to exist for its own sake as the cultural product of its own time and place. I wish to underline from the outset that I have not written a study of Hellenistic iambography as a conduit from Archilochus to Horace, Persius, and Juvenal. I do not mean to suggest in any way that such a history of the iambographic tradition would be misguided, but simply to affirm that such is not the purpose of this book. I have intentionally avoided extensive discussion of Latin poetry and in particular Roman satire. I have used Latin sources where they aid an interpretation of the text of Callimachus, but I have not pursued the subject of the influence of the *Iambi* on Latin poetry. This is an extensive subject in its own right, with its own questions of translation and cultural memory, and one I intend to make the object of a later study. Similarly I have not written a survey of archaic iambic poetry. This study of Callimachus' *Iambi* is interested in archaic iambic where the earlier tradition informs the later one.

It is the traditional practice when working with a numbered sequence of poems to treat them in that order. I have not followed this practice here. Rather I have chosen to treat the poems by theme. In part this choice was the result of observing so many parallels between certain pairs of poems, whether parallels of language, imagery, or subject. *Iambi* 1 and 13 are both concerned with archaic iambic, and take the form of a certain kind of critical dialogue. *Iambi* 2 and 4 both manipulate animal fable for very Alexandrian ends. *Iambi* 3 and 5 are both

homoerotic and both construed around concepts of sexual behavior. The choice of treating the poems by theme was also brought about in part through observing that the poems in the collection are not so much arranged purely sequentially as arranged in groups. *Iambi* 1–4 are composed in stichic choliambics, in a literary Ionic and apparently all set in the poet's contemporary Alexandria. *Iambi* 5–7 are epodic, the last two markedly set in distant places. *Iambi* 6 and 7 are composed in alternating ithyphallics and iambic trimeters, and in a literary Doric.

I have therefore chosen to treat by theme the nine *Iambi* of which we have substantial surviving papyrus text (1–7, 12, and 13) and one two-line fragment (9). Each theme is not only the subject of two (or in one case of three) of Callimachus' *Iambi,* but also illustrates Callimachus' relationship to an earlier iambic tradition. These themes include Callimachus' manipulation of the figure of Hipponax and of Hipponactean verse, his use of paradigm whether elevated or popular, ethical criticism, and the presentation and description of statuary. These themes provide ways of seeing Callimachus' relationship to the iambic tradition and also that of the *Iambi* to the rest of his oeuvre, for Callimachus is a very self-referential poet. A picture emerges of an Alexandrian iambic poet who criticizes and sets standards of aesthetics and decorum, while constantly reminding his audience of the less elevated aspects of the iambic tradition. This last he does through choice of traditional iambic features, whether language and imagery, or popular narrative form (e.g. fable). In this respect it is correct to speak of the poet of the *Iambi* as a voice at once Alexandrian and Hipponactean, and his poems as representative of a collusion of two worlds.

VI

The six chapters of this study share a common structure. Each consists of a text and facing translation of one or more poems, accompanying notes, and a thematic interpretation. The majority of Greek passages discussed in the interpretative essays are given with translations, in the hope of making the study accessible to the reader with limited or no Greek.

The texts of the poems are taken from R. Pfeiffer's edition with supplementation from the following sources (all supplementation is clearly explained in the notes to each text). (1) Although there have not been significant papyrus discoveries of the *Iambi* in the decades since Pfeiffer's edition, the papyri have been read again, particularly in the context of a 1966–67 Oxford papyrology seminar. A. W. Bulloch

kindly made his notes from this seminar available to me. With permission of the seminar's participants, readings from this seminar are considered in the notes to the texts, and in some cases are included in the texts themselves with annotation. (2) Some conjectures and supplements have been proposed in the ongoing scholarship on these poems. (3) I myself have made a few textual conjectures.

The translations of the *Iambi* and of the Diegeseis are my own. My purpose in translating the poems when I began this study was to provide an English rendition of all of the texts under consideration as we have them, as those which were available gave only select lines that were better preserved. This often resulted in a rather limited view of the poems, when in fact partial lines or even sole words could provide a great deal more. In part G. B. D'Alessio, whose excellent Italian edition of Callimachus includes translations for all the extant text, has anticipated my undertaking. However, there remains no such complete translation in English. For the ten *Iambi* which are the subject of this study there is now available to the reader an English version of all of the extant Greek text.

The commentary notes are not intended to be exhaustive. For the most part they elucidate difficult textual problems or discuss possible alternate readings. For the reader they will be especially useful in those instances where alternate readings have been proposed to Pfeiffer's text.

VII

The opening line of the *Iambi* commands its audience not in the voice of Callimachus, but seemingly in the voice of Hipponax. The final image of the *Iambi* is of a journey to Ephesus not undertaken. The first two chapters of this study are concerned with Hipponax and Hipponactean verse in *Iambi* 1 and 13. Callimachus revives an archaic genre in part by refashioning one of its original voices, in part by refashioning its nature and limitations. These first two chapters seek to uncover and elucidate the many elements in this poetic undertaking.

In *Iambi* 1 and 12 a gift, and the symbolism of a gift, are at the center of the narrative. These poems are the subject of my third chapter. *Iambus* 12 is itself a gift to a baby girl, the daughter of an acquaintance of the poet. The poem in turn tells of Apollo's gift of song to the newly born Hebe. Apollo's gift serves as a paradigm for the poet's own, as Apollo the singer valorizes the calling of the poet Callimachus. Paradigmatic too is the tale of the cup of Bathycles recounted in *Iambus* 1.

One sage gives the gold cup to another sage as each acknowledges his successor in a line of giving to be the best recipient of this symbol of mortal excellence. In the end, the cup is dedicated to Apollo in a gesture of reverence and collegiality, which contrasts vividly with the querulous behavior of the Alexandrian literati to whom this tale is recounted.

Animal fable is a form of popular didactic narrative that has close associations with the traditions of archaic iambic poetry. In *Iambi* 2 and 4 Callimachus specifically acknowledges the heritage of fable in his own renditions of fable, which comment on his contemporaries and his own poetry. The subject of chapter 4 is these poems that take the form of fables, and that both evoke the origin of the fables recounted and the novel character of their re-creation.

The fifth chapter has as its subject the two *Iambi* specifically concerned with ethical criticism and sexual behavior. *Iambi* 3 and 5 are both poems that reflect, yet differently, a tradition of homoerotic relationships with a paideutic character, a tradition that characterizes early elegiac poetry and is the subject of Plato's *Symposium*. In a number of striking aspects these two poems mirror one another. In *Iambus* 3 the poetic voice is one of the narrative figures, and it is his own unrequited love for a venal youth that is the subject of his lament. In *Iambus* 5 the poet, here from the outside, faults a schoolteacher who has abused his pupils. Both poems evoke a heritage gone wrong.

The artworks of the *Iambi* are the focus of the sixth chapter, which centers on the three *Iambi* (6, 7, and 9) that view statuary through verse. These also are poems that share certain features in common; all are in a sense didactic, all are concerned with geographic distance from Callimachus' Alexandria, and all capture an essential Alexandrian interest in commemorating the past in the present.

VIII

Callimachus is not an easy author to read, nor in some respects an easy author to appreciate. His poetry, while not abstruse, assumes a familiarity on the part of its audience with a poetic and cultural heritage of which only a small part remains, and even this small part we view from a great distance and obliquely. In the case of the *Iambi* our knowledge of the tradition in which Callimachus is composing is limited. Archilochus and especially Hipponax survive in very fragmentary form. The *Iambi* of Callimachus are also fragmentary. Reading and trying to read through these poems can indeed seem daunting to the modern reader who first approaches these texts. My study is intended to facilitate this

undertaking, to help the modern reader situate the *Iambi* both in the poetic traditions of archaic iambic poetry and in the extant works of Callimachus and Hellenistic poetry generally. If in the following pages I succeed in elucidating any of the more enigmatic parts of these fascinating poems, in making these fragmentary, allusive, and highly self-referential works in any way more accessible and more enjoyable, I shall be well content.

ONE

Callimachus and the Adaptation of Hipponax

Iambus 1

The figure of the sixth-century B.C.E. poet Hipponax and the evocation of his verse pervade Callimachus' *Iambi*. When Callimachus chooses to compose poems in choliambic meter, he is already attaching himself on one level to Hipponax.[1] For it is with Hipponax that these iambic lines with their final "limping" long syllables are especially associated. This metrical choice in and of itself places Callimachus in a tradition of iambic poetry, a tradition of distinct language and imagery, and one of certain generic expectations. This is true whether he follows in this tradition and its conventions or refashions them. Further, there are recollections of the extant lines of Hipponax throughout the *Iambi*. For Callimachus as an iambic poet the figure of Hipponax is clearly one that legitimizes his compositions in the genre, whether as imitation or as variation.[2]

Yet the figure of Hipponax has another, more complex, and more explicit role in the *Iambi*. Callimachus opens *Iambus* 1 not in his own voice, but seemingly in that of Hipponax. *Iambus* 13 concludes with an avowal to have *not* sought inspiration to compose choliambic verses in sixth-century Ephesus. These are both choliambic poems in which an authorial poetic voice assumes a didactic stance before a critical audience, and in both an appeal to Hipponax and to his poetry constitutes an appeal to a distinct moral and poetic authority. In trying to appreciate the role of Hipponax in the *Iambi,* we need to discern the way in which Callimachus is viewing his predecessor, the way by which a vitriolic, satiric figure has become a model of ethical and aesthetic criticism.

1. See Hunter (1997) 41.

2. See A. T. Cozzoli, "Il I giambo e il nuovo ἰαμβίζειν di Callimaco," *Eikasmos* 7 (1996): 129.

Iambus 1 (fr. 191 Pf.)

ʾΑκούcαθ' ʿΙππώνακτοc· ιοȷὺ γὰρ ἀλλ' ἥκω
ἐκ τῶν ὅκου βοῦν κολλύιβου πȷιπρήcκουcιν,
φέρων ἴαμβον οὐ μάχην ιἀείδȷοντα
τὴν Βοȷυ̣πιάλȷε̣ι̣οȷ̣ν̣ [.]. ν̣ά̣. [. . . ἄ]νθρωποc
]. . β[ι]. ειν
ὦ̃]νδρεc οἳ νῦν[ι]κ̣έπφ[
κα]τηύληcθ' οἱ με̣[ι Διω]ν̣ύcου
]τε Μουcέων . α[ι]. ʾΑπόλλωνοc
ἐc τὸ πρȷὸ τείχευc ἱρὸν ι ιἁλέεcȷ δεῦτε,
οὗ τὸνȷ πάλαι Πάγχαιοιν ὁ πλάcαc Ζᾶνα
γέρωνȷ λαλάζων ἄδιικα βιβλία ψήχει.
]ι̣ γὰρ ἐντὸc ου[
]άγη τιc· η πολ[
]ντα βωμοί τ[
]ν̣ πρὸc ΄Αιδην[
ἄν]δρεc ὀκόcοι βο̣[
]ηδοι Μοῦcα τ̣[
]ν̣ον ὅcτιc ἐμ[
]δε καὶ τὸν ὃc χ[
]ν̣ ἑταίρην ατ[
ἴ]αμβον ὅcτι̣[c

Text: *P. Oxy.* 1011 preserves the majority of *Iambus* 1: fol. 2v the inscription ΚΑΛΛΙΜΑΧΟΥ IAM[BOI and lines 1–10, fol. 2r lines 26–51, fol. 3v lines 54–73, fol. 3r lines 78–98. *P. Oxy.* 1363 contains lines 5–34. Some individual lines are known also from other sources, including lines 9–11, 52–53 and 74–76.
Meter: stichic choliambic.
Dialect: literary Ionic.

1 οὐ γὰρ ἀλλ' is a particle cluster that is common particularly in old comedy (cf. *GP* 31) but that can be attested elsewhere in iambography, as at Phoenix fr. 1.15 Powell οὐ γὰρ ἀλλὰ κηρύσσω; cf. Phoenix fr. 1.17 Powell νῦν δ' οὐκέτ' οὐδέν, ἀλλὰ γῆ πεποίημαι. The particle cluster οὐ γὰρ ἀλλ' can, however, also be understood to reassert something which might be initially doubted.
2 κολλύιβου The κόλλυβος, a coin of infinitesimal monetary value, appears elsewhere as an emblem of poverty (e.g. Ar. *Peace* 1200 οὐδεὶς ἐπρίατ' ἂν δρέπανον οὐδὲ κολλύβου) and cheapness as a characteristic of Hades appears to have been almost proverbial; cf. Callim. Ep. 13.5–6 Pf. (G.-P. 31), Gow-Page, *HE* vol. 2, 189.
6 ὦ̃]νδρεc The conjectured reading ὦ̃]νδρεc seems fairly secure given the parallel of line 26 (cited as the lemma of the *Schol. Flor.* to lines 26 ff.). Cf. Pfeiffer app. crit.
7 Διω]ν̣ύcου Hunt ed. princ.

Listen to Hipponax. For indeed I have come
from the place where they sell an ox for a penny,
bearing an *iambus* which does not sing
of the Bupalean battle [.]. ν̣ά̣. [. . .] man
]. . β[⏐]. ειν
O men of the present day [⏐ as the?] seabirds
you are crazed at the sound of the flute[⏐ of Dio]nysus
]and of the Muses . α[⏐]. of Apollo
here in a throng to the shrine before the wall,
where the old man who fashioned the ancient Panchaean Zeus
chatters and scratches out his unrighteous books.
]ι̣ for within ου[
]άγη someone · η πολ[
]ντα altars τ[
]ν̣ to Hades[
] men however so many βο̣[
]η̣δοι Muse τ̣[
]ν̣ον whoever ἐμ[
]δ̣ε and him who χ[
]ν̣ companion ατ[
]whoever iambus[

11 λαλάζων is the reading of the papyrus. The other sources that preserve lines 9–11 all have ἀλαζών [braggart or fraud]. See D'Alessio (1996) 580, n. 11. A. Kerkhecker, *Callimachus' Book of* Iambi (Oxford, 1999), 24 presents strong support for reading ἀλαζών.

11 ψήχει Cf. Pfeiffer's app. crit. for ψύχει / ψήχει. The parallel textual problem at Hippon. fr. 84.17 W. (86 Deg.) is worth noting. The reading ψήχει gives an especially effective contrast to the conjecture καταψήχων at line 70.

12–25 *P. Oxy.* 1363 preserves only the central portion of these lines, the second and third feet of the choliambic line. The papyrus is, however, easily legible. The Diegesis reveals little more on this part of the text, and the *Scholia Florentina* (*PSI* 1094 [fr. a] 1–9) to these lines are too fragmentary to yield much. Dieg. VI, lines 4–6 read as follows: ἥκου⏐ϲι δ' αὐτοῖϲ (sc. τοῖϲ φιλολόγοιϲ) κατ' εἴλαϲ ἀπαγορεύει φθονεῖν⏐ἀλλήλοιϲ . . . [when they come in swarms he enjoins them not to envy one another . . .]. It is possible that κατ' εἴλαϲ in the Diegesis is to be drawn to ε̣ἰ̣λη̣δό̣ν [in droves], at *Iambus* 1.28 (the text here however is very uncertain, see Pfeiffer's comments). In this case it appears even less likely that anything in the Diegesis can be used to elucidate lines 12–25.

21 ἴ]αμβον The second allusion to the genre (see ἴαμβον line 3) from which the *Iambi* evolve.

]. ὡc τιc τοὺc ν[
]άμετρα τοιc[
]ν ὅcτιc τηι[
π]ολλούc· ἐν[
ὤπολλον, ὦινδρεc, ὡc | παρ᾽ αἰπόλῳ μυῖαι
ἢ cφῆκεc | ἐκ γῆc ἢ ἀπὸ θύματοc Δελφ[οί,
ε̣ἰλη̣δὸν [ἐc]|μεύουcιν |· ὦ ῾Εκάτη πλήθευc.
ὁ̣ ψιλοκόρc|ηc τὴν πνοὴν ἀναλώcει
φυcέων ι̣ὅκ̣|ωc μὴ τὸ|ν τρίβωνα γυμνώcῃ.
cωπὴ γενέcθω | καὶ γρ|άφεcθε τὴν ῥῆcιν.
ἀνὴρ Βαθυκλῆ|c ᾽Αρκ|άc—οὐ μακρὴν ἄξω,
ὦ λῷcτε μὴ cίμαι|νε, καὶ γὰρ οὐδ᾽ αὐτόc
μ̣έγα cχολάζ[ω·] | δ[ε]ῖ | με γὰρ μέcον δινεῖν
φεῦ φ]εῦ ᾽Αχέρο[ντ]οc—τῶν πάλαι τιc εὐδαίμων
ἐγένετο, πά[ν]τα δ᾽ εἶχεν οἷcιν ἄνθρωποι
θεοί τε λευκι|ὰc ἡμέ|ραc ἐπίcτανται.
ἤδη καθίκ[ειν οὗτ]οc ἡνίκ᾽ ἤμελλεν
ἐc̣ μακρὸν [. . . . .]—καὶ γὰρ ε̣. . . ọc ἔζωcε—,
τῶν . . . . . [. . . .] τοὺc μὲν ἔνθα, τοὺc δ᾽ ἔνθα
ἔcτηcε τοῦ κλιντῆροc—εἶχε γὰρ δεcμ[ό]c—
μέλλονταc ἤδη παρθένοιc ἁλινδεῖcθαι.
μόλιc δ᾽ ἐπά[ραc] ὡc πότηc ἐπ᾽ ἀγκῶνα
. .]. . . ν ὁ̣ ᾽Α̣ρ̣κ[ὰc κ]ἀνὰ τὴν cτέγην βλέψαc
.]. . .ν̣οιc. [. . .]. . [
ἔ]πειτ᾽ ἔφ[ηcε
'ὦ π|αῖδεc ὦι ἐμαὶ τὠπιόντοc ἄγκυραι
. .]. . . λο. . [
β]ούλεcθε ῥέξω[
c]ὺν θεοῖcι καὶ. [.
. . . .]. . [

22 ὡc τιc Kerkhecker (1999) 26 following Maas reads χὥcτιc, which well suits the catalogue structure of these lines.

23]άμετρα Pfeiffer suggests either πεντάμετρα or ἑξάμετρα. The parallel of *Iambus* 13.31 cὺ πεντάμετρα cυντίθει, cὺ δ᾽ ἡ̣[ρῷο]ν [you compose pentameters, you the heroic], may give some support to the the former, as Callimachus appears to be using ἡρῷα in this context of the latter poem of epic meters. Cf. also *Iambus* 13.45 π]εντάμετρον. Cf., however, Wilamowitz' conjecture ἑξά̣[μετρον *Iambus* 13.43.

34 cχολάζ[ω There is a possible *double entendre* of the verb, here σχολάζω [to be at leisure] can also have the sense "to give lectures" (LSJ s.v. σχολάζω III.3). See M. R.

]. ὡς whoever the ν[
pent]ameters τοις[
]ν̣ whoever τηι[
]many · ἐν[

O Apollo, the men, as flies by a goatherd
or wasps from the ground, or Delphians from a sacrifice,
they swarm in droves. O Hecate, what a throng!
The bald-headed one will waste his breath blowing
that he not be stripped of his threadbare cloak.
Let there be silence and write down my tale.
Bathycles, a man of Arcadia—I will not draw on at length,
good man, do not turn up your nose, for truly even I have not
much time. For alas, alas, I must whirl
in the midst of Acheron—was one of the blessed of old
and he had everything with which men
and gods know joyful days.
And when he was about to come to the long [journey]
—for indeed he had lived (virtuously?)—
of his (sons) he placed some here,
some there about his couch—a bond constrained them—
already about to roll about with girls.
With difficulty raising himself on his elbow, as at a banquet,
. .]. . . ν the Arcadian looking up along the ceiling
.]. . . ν̣οις. [. . .]. . [
then he said[
“My children, my anchors as I go out
. .]. . .λο. . [
you want I will do[
and with the gods . [.
. . . .]. . [

Falivene, “Callimaco serio-comico: il primo Giambo, (fr. 191 Pf.)” *Tradizione e Innovazione nella Cultura Greca da Omero all’ Età Ellenistica: Scritti in Onore di Bruno Gentili* ed. R. Pretagostini, Vol. 3 *Letteratura Ellenistica* (Rome, 1993), 921, n. 57. Callimachus’ audience might understand this in part as a reference to the Hipponax not of sixth-century Ephesus but of the later tradition which makes him into something of a moralist (and hence an appropriate σχολαστικός). This is the very tradition on which Callimachus is drawing in his presentation of this figure and his harangue in *Iambus* 1.

41 κλιντῆρος Pfeiffer’s punctuation, Add. et Corr. II 117.

[about 15 lines are missing in *P. Oxy.* 1011: lines 52–53 are preserved in another source]

. . . . . .

ιἔπλευcεν ἐc Μίλητον· ἦν γὰρ ἡ νίκη
Θάλητοc, ὅc τ' ἦν ἄλλα δεξιὸc γνώμηνJ
καὶ τῆc 'Αμάξηc ἐλέγετο cταθμήcαcθαι
τοὺc ἀcτερίcκουc, ᾗ πλέουcι Φοίνικεc.
εὗρεν δ' ὁ Προυcέληνο[c] ᾳ̣ὶcίῳ cίττῃ
ἐν τοῦ Δ̣ιδυμέοc τὸν γέρ[o]ντα κωνῄῳ
ξύοντα τὴν γῆν καὶ γράφοντα τὸ cχῆμα,
τοὐξεῦρ' ὁ Φρὺξ Εὔφορβιοc, ὅctιc ἀνθρώπων
τριίγωνα καὶ cκιαληνὰJ πρῶτοc ἔγριαJψε
καὶ κύκλον έπ[. . .]ικὴδίδαξε νηcτεύειν
τῶν ἐμπνεόιντων· οἱ̣ ι'Ιταλοὶ δ' ὑπήκουcαν,
οὐ πάντεc, ἀλλ' οὓc εἶχεν ιοὔτεροc δαίμων.
πρὸc δή [μ]ιν ὧδ' ἔφηcε. [
ἐκεῖ[νο] τοὐλόχρυcον ἐξ[ελὼν πήρηc·
'οὑμὸc πατὴρ ἐφεῖτο τοῦ[το τοὔκπωμα
δοῦ[ναι], τίc ὑμέων τῶν cοφ[ῶν ὀνήιcτοc
τῶν ἑπτά· κἠγὼ cοὶ δίδωμ[ι πρωτῇον.'
ἔτυψε δὲ] cκίπωνι τοὔδα[φοc πρέcβυc
καὶ τ]ὴν ὑπήνην τἠτέρῃ [καταψήχων
ἐξεῖπ[ε·] 'τ̣ὴν δ̣ό̣cιν μὲν [
cὺ δ' εἰ̣ [το]κ̣εῶνοc μὴ λό[γοιc ἀπειθήcειc,
Βίηc [. . . . . ˙.]ε̣ι̣λ̣[

[about 20 lines are missing in the papyrus; four are known from elsewhere].

. . . . . .

Cόλων· ἐκεῖνοc δ' ὡc Χίλων' ἀπέcτειλεν

. . . . . .

πάλιν τὸ δῶρον ἐc Θάλητ' ἀνώλιcθεν

. . . . . .

'Θάληc με τῷ μεδεῦντι Νείλεω δήμου

62 οἱ̣ ι'Ιταλοὶ δ' ὑπήκουcαν This reading, proposed by H. Lloyd-Jones, "Callimachus fr. 191.62," *CR,* n.s., 17 (1967): 125–27, gives a smoother sense than the reading οἱ̣ ιδ' ἄρ' οὐχ ὑπήκουcαν, with which Pfeiffer, following Niebuhr, corrected Diod. 10.6.4 τάδ' οὐδ' ὑπήκουcαν πάντεc. See further D'Alessio (1996) 586, n. 28.

[about 15 lines are missing]

. . . . . .

he sailed to Miletus. For the victory fell to Thales
who was of able mind in other things,
and who was said to have measured out the little stars
of the Wagon, by which the Phoenicians sail.
And the Arcadian by happy chance found the old man
in the shrine of Apollo at Didyma
scratching the ground with a staff, and drawing the figure
that the Phrygian Euphorbus discovered,
who first of men drew unequal triangles and the circle,
and who taught men to abstain from living creatures.
The Italians obeyed him, not all,
but those whom the other spirit constrained.
To him he spoke thus. [
having taken that golden goblet from his satchel.
"My father enjoined me to bestow this cup
on the one of you seven wise men who is best;
and I give first prize to you."
The old man struck the ground with his stick,
and scratching his beard with his other hand, said
"The gift [
but if you will not disobey his words,
Bias [. . . . . ʽ.]ε̣ι̣λ̣[

[about 20 lines are missing; four are known from elsewhere]

. . . . . .

Solon. But he sent it to Chilon

. . . . . .

and again the gift returned to Thales

. . . . . .

"Thales, having received this prize twice,

δίδωcι, τοῦτο δὶc λαβὼν ἀριcτῆον.'

. . . . . .

ἀλλ' ἢν ὁρῇ τιc, 'οὗτοc 'Αλκμέων' φήcει
καὶ 'φεῦγε· βάλλει· φεῦγ'' ἐρεῖ 'τὸν ἄνθρωπον.'
ἕκαcτ[ο]c αὐτὸν .[. .] α. ᾳθρα κηρύccει
ὡc υcτ. . . . cιν οιc. . . κοτ. . . . ̂. . . .
ὁ δ' ἐξόπιcθε Κω[ρ]υκαῖοc ἐγχάcκει
τὴν γλῶccαν †ελων ὡc κύων ὅταν πίνῃ,
καί φηcι τοὐπι[. . . . .]c ἐκπλεύc[
ε. τα[. .]΄. .[ ]. αι. ηξει. [
τὰ τράιχηλα γυμνάζει
]. . . . . ουcκορ . μοc
μαν]θάνοντεc οὐδ' ἄλφα
]. . . κονδύλῳ καπηλεῦc[αι
]. . . . . νι[.]αcυλλο .
]ουcερ. ρ. . οcω [πέ]πλον
]ηρ μοῦνοc εἶλε τὰc [Μο]ύcαc
]. οι χλωρὰ cῦκα τρωγούcα[c
]λου καὶ γέλωτοc [
μὴ] πίθηcθε· καὶ γὰρ η. [
]. . . ι τοῦ Χάρωνοc ιν. . . .ν[
]ώλυε κἀποπλεῖν ὥρη
]ήcαc ε[ ]τω κυcω

. . . . . .

[about 20 lines are missing in the papyrus, of which 3, the beginning of *Iambus* 2, are known from elsewhere]

98]τω κυcω Apparently "to the ass" (Hesych. s.v. κυσός· ἡ πυγή; γυναικεῖον αἰδοῖον [4738]), one of several graphically obscene images in the *Iambi*.

grants me to him who protects the people of Neleus."

. . . . . .

But if someone sees, he will say, "This one is Alcmeon,"
and "flee—he strikes—flee the man" he will say.

Each him . [. .] α. αθρα will herald
how υcτ. . . . cιν οιc. . . κοτ. . . . . .
The Corycean gapes from behind
(curling?) his tongue like a dog when it drinks
and says τοὐπι[. . . . .]c (sail?)
ε . τα[. .]. .[ ]. αι. ηξει. [
exercises the throat
]. . . . . ουcκορ. μοc
] knowing not even alpha
]. . . to trade in blows
]. . . . . νι[.] αcυλλο .
]ουcερ. ρ. . ocω cloak
]ηρ alone took the Muses
]. οι eating green figs
]λου and of laughter
do not] be persuaded; for indeed η .[
]. . . ι of Charon ιν. . . . ν[
]ώλυε and the hour to sail away
]ήcαc ε[ ]τω to the ass

. . . . . .

Diegesis to *Iambus* 1

VI

1 ’Ακούcαθ’ ‘Ιππώνακτοc· οὐ γὰρ ἀλλ’ ἥκω
‘Υποτίθεται φθιτὸν ‘Ιππώνακτα cυγκαλοῦν-
τα τοὺc φιλολόγουc εἰc τὸ Παρ-
μενίωνοc καλούμενον Caραπίδειον· ἥκου-
5 cι δ’ αὐτοῖc κατ’ εἴλαc ἀπαγορεύει φθονεῖν
ἀλλήλοιc, λέγων ὡc Βαθυκλῆc ’Αρκὰc τελευ-
τῶν τήν τε ἄλλην οὐcίαν διέθετο καὶ δὴ
χρυcοῦν ἔκπωμα τῷ μέcῳ τῶν υἱῶν
’Αμφάλκῃ ἐνεχείριcεν, ὅπωc δῷ τῷ ἀρίcτῳ
10 τῶν ἑπτὰ cοφῶν. ὁ δὲ ἐλθὼν εἰc Μίλητον
ἐδίδου τοῦτο Θάλητι ὡc διαφέρ[ο]ντι τῶν ἄλλων,
ὁ δὲ ἀπέπεμψε πρὸc Βίαντα τὸν Πριηνέα, ὁ
δὲ πρὸc Περίανδρον τὸν Κορίνθιον, ὁ δὲ ὡc Cό-
λωνα τὸν ’Αθηναῖον, ὁ [δ]ὲ πρὸ[c] Χίλωνα τὸν
15 Λ[α]κεδαι[μό]νιον, ὁ δὲ πρὸc Π[ιτ]τακὸν τὸν Μι-
τυλη[ναῖον, ὁ δ]ὲ πρὸc [Κ]λ̣εύ[βο]υ̣λ̣[ο]ν τὸν Λί[ν-
δι̣[ο]ν.[τὸ δὲ ἔκπωμα] ὑπὸ τούτου [π]ε̣μφθὲν [ἦλ-
θε πάλιν εἰc Θάλητα· ὁ] δὲ ἀνατίθη[cι] τ̣ῷ̣ [Δ]ιδυμ[εῖ
’Α]πόλ[λωνι δὶc λαβ]ὼν ἀριcτε[ῖο]ν. τοιγαρ[οῦν
20 ἔφη. [. . . . .]αιο.[. . . . .] ἀλλήλω̣ν
κρ.τ[. . . . .]ι̣ο̣ι̣c̣τ̣[. . . . . ἐ]ρίζεcθε.

2 ‘Υποτίθεται One of the rare comments which seeks to capture something of the nature of the poem.

3 φιλολόγουc The text of *P. Mil.* I 18 has φιλοcοφουc corrected to φιλολογουc.

21 ἐ]ρίζεcθε The change in person suggests that this may be a direct citation from the poem, as Pfeiffer proposed. It may well also be that the dialogue form established at the beginning of the poem with the Hipponactean figure and the *philologoi* continued at the end (cf. line 95 μὴ] πίθηcθε).

"Listen to Hipponax. For indeed I have come"
He imagines the dead Hipponax summoning together
the *philologoi* to the temple of Sarapis
called that of Parmenio. When they come
in swarms he enjoins them not to envy one another,
telling how the Arcadian Bathycles
in dying bequeathed the rest of his wealth
and handed a gold cup to Amphalces, his middle son,
that he give it to the best of the seven wise men.
And he, going to Miletus, gave it to Thales,
as he was superior to the rest,
but he sent it away to Bias of Priene, and he to
Periander of Corinth, and he to
Solon the Athenian, and he to Chilon
the Lacedaemonian, and he to Pittacus
of Mytilene, and he to Cleobulus
the Lindian. The cup sent by this one
came back to Thales. And he receiving it twice
as an award dedicated it to Apollo at Didyma. Wherefore
he said . [. . . . .]αιο.[. . . . .] of one another
κρ.τ[. . . . .]ιοιςτ[. . . . .] you quarrel.

Interpretation

I begin my discussion of the two poems, *Iambi* 1 and 13, which may well be termed the "Hipponactean," with Hipponax himself, for he is the model in contradistinction to whom Callimachus composes his own choliambic verses. Therefore, I turn first to the model, a reappraisal of some of the Hipponactean material: the testimonia, the fragments, and the later fictive funerary epigrams. I then turn in this and the following chapter to the passages from *Iambi* 1 and 13 that develop this contradistinction.

Hipponax as Critic: Bupalus, Athenis, and Mimnes

The remarkable presence of several artists in the surviving lines of Hipponax and their importance in the testimonia have received too little attention in the assessment of this poet, or rather attention only of a certain nature. The story of Hipponax' quarrel with the sculptors Bupalus and Athenis is given in the testimonia.[3] According to the tradi-

3. *Suda* 2.665.16 Adler, Plin. *H.N.* 36.11:

Ἱππῶναξ Πυθέω καὶ μητρὸς Πρωτίδος, Ἐφέσιος, ἰαμβογράφος. ᾤκησε δὲ Κλαζομενὰς ὑπὸ τῶν τυράννων Ἀθηναγόρα καὶ Κωμᾶ ἐξελαθείς. γράφει δὲ πρὸς Βούπαλον καὶ Ἄθηνιν ἀγαλματοποιούς, ὅτι αὐτοῦ εἰκόνας πρὸς ὕβριν εἰργάσαντο.

Hipponax, son of Pytheus and of Protis, Ephesian, iambographer. He came to live in Clazomenae on being exiled by the tyrants Athenagoras and Komas. He wrote against the sculptors Bupalus and Athenis, because they made likenesses of him with an eye to mockery.

iam fuerat in Chio insula Melas scalptor, dein filius eius Micciades ac deinde nepos Archermus, cuius filii Bupalus et Athenis vel clarissimi in ea scientia fuere Hipponactis poetae aetate, quem certum est LX Olympiade fuisse (540 / 537) . . . *Hipponacti notabilis foeditas vultus erat; quamobrem imaginem eius lascivia iocosam hi proposuere ridentium circulis. quod Hipponax indignatus destrinxit amaritudinem carminum in tantum ut credatur aliquis ad laquem eos compulisse: quod falsum est, complura enim in finitimis insulis simulacra postea fecere, sicut in Delo, quibus subiecerunt carmen, non vitibus tantum censeri Chium sed et operibus Archermi filiorum.*

There was once on the island of Chios a sculptor named Melas, whose son was Micciades and whose grandson was Archermus. This last had two sons Bupalus and Athenis, <both> especially celebrated for their art at the time of the poet Hipponax, whom it is agreed flourished in the sixtieth Olympiad (540–537) . . . Hipponax' face was of an astounding hideousness. For this reason these two set forth a ludicrous likeness of him for the enjoyment of their cohorts. Wherefore Hipponax, outraged, let loose against them the bile of his poetry to such an extent that some believe he drove them to suicide. This is untrue, for they made many more sculptures afterwards on the neighboring islands, such as on Delos, on which they affixed

tion, the two men made a likeness ridiculing the appearance of the poet, and thus brought upon themselves the wrathful barbs of his verse. Certain features of the testimonia are clearly corrupted by the biographical tradition of Archilochus, and modern scholarship is correctly cautious in its approach to such biographical traditions altogether. Nonetheless, the presence of the two sculptors deserves careful consideration for what it shows us about Hipponax' poetry and his stance as poetic voice.

The scholarship on Hipponax generally evaluates the significance of Bupalus and Athenis, and of their father, the sculptor Archermus, in one of the following ways:

1. Pliny, at *H.N.* 36.11, notes that Bupalus and Athenis flourished at the time of Hipponax, "of whom it is certain that he lived in the sixtieth Olympiad." This testimonium on the sculptors themselves is now conversely emphasized for its value, among other testimonia, in determining the date of Hipponax.
2. What we can ascertain with any certainty of the work of these sculptors (such as the base of a statue found at Delos inscribed with the name of Archermus), may be used to argue for the biographical existence of Hipponax.[4]
3. The presence of these and other artisans argues for a particular sociopolitical stance of the poetic voice.[5]

Overlooked in all of these lines of discussion is the simple but essential fact that Bupalus and Athenis were sculptors, and it is a product of their art that, according to the testimonia, aroused the poet's wrath.

For this last essential observation the only source is the testimonia. The meager extant verses of Hipponax do not confirm that the poet composed invective verse as a response to an artistic creation of the two sculptors. It is, however, worthwhile before proceeding to con-

---

a poem, that Chios is valued not only for its vines but also for the works of the sons of Archermus.

Further testimonia in M. L. West, ed., *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum Cantati* (Oxford, 1971), 110, E. Degani, ed., *Hipponactis Testimonia et Fragmenta* (Stuttgart, 1991), 1–9.

4. See *Inscr. Délos,* 9; O. Masson, *Les Fragments du Poète Hipponax* (Paris, 1962), 13, n. 1.

5. E.g. Degani (1984) 204–5, who sees Hipponax not as a popular poetic voice but rather as something of a disgruntled aristocratic voice, a satirist of the rising commercial classes. He concludes (205): "La poesia ipponattea, da questo punto di vista, è la satire di tutta una *Weltanschauung*, quella appunto dei πονηροί, di fronte alla cui resistibile accesa i χρηστοί come Ipponatte si sentivano sempre piú emarginati."

sider in what light the object of the poet's invective verse is shown in the fragments themselves. Where Bupalus appears by name,[6] he is often the object of scurrilous sexual insult,[7] which is itself an ethical judgment. The corpus of Hipponax is replete with ethical judgment of behavior, such as irregular eating,[8] thievery,[9] and oath-breaking.[10] That it is a medium for criticism of ethical behavior is obvious, and Bupalus is one of its objects. Even if we had no evidence for criticism of artistic creation in Hipponax we could confidently place the narrative, given in the testimonia, within the larger realm of ethical criticism.

Fortunately there is such direct evidence. In fr. 28 W. (39 Deg.) the speaker reviles a painter named Mimnes for his failure to paint a serpent on the side of a trireme in the right direction:

Μιμνῆ κατωμόχανε, μηκέτι γράψηις
ὄπφιν τριήρεος ἐν πολυζύγωι τοίχωι
ἀπ' ἐμβόλου φεύγοντα πρὸς κυβερνήτην·
αὕτη γὰρ ἔσται συμφορή τε καὶ κληδών,
νικύρτα καὶ σάβαννι, τῶι κυβερνήτηι,
ἢν αὐτὸν ὄπφις τὠντικνήμιον δάκηι.

Mimnes, gaping to the shoulders,[11] no longer paint
the snake in flight from the beak to the helmsman
on the many-benched wall of the trireme.
For it will be a catastrophe and an ill omen
for the helmsman, you slave of slaves and baseborn scoundrel,
if the snake bites him on the shin.

6. Athenis appears by name only at fr. 70.11 W. (70.1 Deg.) Ἄ̣θηνι κυ̣[| ἐπ' ἦισεπ̣[| ἔστησα . [.

7. E.g., fr. 12.2 W. (20.2 Deg.) ὁ μητροκοίτης Βούπαλος [Bupalus who sleeps with his mother] and fr. 15 W. (18 Deg.) τί τῶι τάλαντι Βουπάλωι συνοίκησας; [why do you cohabit with that wretch Bupalus?].

8. E.g., frr. 128 W. (126 Deg.), 118 W. (129 Deg.).

9. E.g., fr. *117 W. (196 dub. Deg.).

10. E.g., fr. *115 W. (194 dub. Deg.).

11. For discussion of this *hapax*, see Masson (1962) 120, Degani in his notes to this fragment. There are several similar images in Aristophanes: cf. *Ach.* 104, *Knights* 964. Cf. the discussion in J. Henderson, *The Maculate Muse* (Oxford, 1991), 21, entry 46, and n. 10. The sexual insult here in these lines that clearly fault artistic creation is a crucial parallel for the treatment of Bupalus.

There is also a similar image at Achilles Tatius 4.19.5 in a description of the crocodile: τὸν μὲν γὰρ ἄλλον χρόνον, παρ' ὅσον οὐ κέχηνε τὸ θηρίον, ἔστι κεφαλή· ὅταν δὲ χάνῃ πρὸς τὰς ἄγρας, ὅλος στόμα γίνεται. Ἀνοίγει δὲ τὴν γένυν τὴν ἄνω, τὴν δὲ κάτω στερεὰν ἔχει· καὶ ἀπόστασίς ἐστι πολλή, καὶ μέχρι τῶν ὤμων τὸ χάσμα, καὶ εὐθὺς ἡ γαστήρ [For the rest of the time, when the beast does not gape, that part is a head. But when it gapes at its prey, it is all mouth. It opens its upper jaw upward, and keeps the other rigid. So great is the distance apart that the opening goes to its shoulders and the stomach is right there.] I thank Luigi Battezzato for bringing this passage to my attention.

Bupalus, Athenis, and Mimnes, the objects of the invective poet's derision, are all artists. The striking element here is that Hipponax faults all of these artists, directly or indirectly, for something each has done aesthetically wrong or in a displeasing manner. In other words, the poet presents himself as a critic of aesthetics. There is, it is true, variation in the way in which the poet applies this criticism. In the case of Bupalus and Athenis, where the criticism is of the hideousness of a sculpture of the poet, Hipponax makes the sculptors more generally the objects of his invective verse. In the case of the Mimnes fragment above, he levels the criticism directly at the artistic creation. Yet in both instances the result is still aesthetic criticism by the poet.

This aspect of the poetry of Hipponax could not be more significant in light of his importance in the later iambic tradition. In this later tradition poets may employ the choliambic line as a medium for the criticism of works of sculpture or painting, as in the fourth *Mime* of Herodas, or of poetic composition, as in Callimachus' *Iambus* 13. This is particularly true of the *Iambi* of Callimachus, several of which, we should remember, are concerned with works of plastic art, most strikingly the sixth *Iambus,* with its exact description of Pheidias' statue of Zeus at Olympia. In the case of *Iambus* 13, which is, after all, at once a poem of aesthetic criticism and a work that proclaims itself a response to the criticism of others, the model of Hipponax as choliambic poet takes on a far greater importance. Here the poem's audience perceives that model not only as a forerunner in the composition of choliambic verse, but also as an earlier critic of aesthetics.

Hipponax in Hellenistic Epigram

Hipponax has a reputation for aggressive attack generally in later literature, especially in the Hellenistic epigrams that play on the fiction of the tomb of Hipponax. While the bite of the poet is prominent in these poems, there is also a clear moral cast to the delineation. This later aspect is well worth keeping in mind in light of the observations that we have drawn in discussing the presence of aesthetic criticism in the testimonia and fragments; both are essential features of Callimachus' adaptation. The two epigrams that follow are characteristic of this later casting of Hipponax.[12]

12. Cf. also Alcaeus *Ep.* 13 G.-P. See further Gow-Page, *HE* vol. 2, 532, 367, Degani (1991) Testimonia 17, 16, P. Bing (1988) 63–66, G. O. Hutchinson, *Hellenistic Poetry* (Oxford, 1988), 48–49, F. Jung, *Hipponax redivivus* (Giessen, 1929), 20–22, M. Gabathuler, *Hellenistische Epigramme auf Dichter* (St. Gallen, 1937), 69–70, 74.

ἀτρέμα τὸν τύμβον παραμείβετε, μὴ τὸν ἐν ὕπνῳ
πικρὸν ἐγείρητε σφῆκ' ἀναπαυόμενον·
ἄρτι γὰρ Ἱππώνακτος ὁ καὶ τοκεῶνε βαΰξας,
ἄρτι κεκοίμηται θυμὸς ἐν ἡσυχίῃ.
ἀλλὰ προμηθήσασθε, τὰ γὰρ πεπυρωμένα κείνου
ῥήματα πημαίνειν οἶδε καὶ εἰν Ἀίδῃ.
Leon. Tar. *Ep.* 58 G.-P.

Pass softly by the tomb, lest you wake
the bitter wasp resting in sleep.
For just now the wrath of Hipponax that barked even at his parents,
just now in quiet has fallen asleep.
But take care, for his flaming words
know how to give pain, even in Hades.

ὁ μουσοποιὸς ἐνθάδ' Ἱππῶναξ κεῖται.
εἰ μὲν πονηρός, μὴ προσέρχευ τῷ τύμβῳ·
εἰ δ' ἐσσὶ κρήγυός τε καὶ παρὰ χρηστῶν,
θαρσέων καθίζευ, κἢν θέλῃς ἀπόβριξον.
Theocr. *Ep.* 13 G.-P.

The poet Hipponax lies here.
If you are wicked, do not approach the tomb.
But if you are honorable and of good parents,
take courage and sit down and, if you like, take a nap.

Hellenistic literature appropriates the poetic past in a manner at once commemorative and refashioning. This literature reclaims poets of distant times and places and re-creates them in a later time for a later audience.[13] The epigram that declares itself the tomb of an earlier poet calls attention both to the poet and to its commemoration of him. In his adaptation of Hipponax in *Iambus* 1, and in his use of the image of the earlier poet's verse in *Iambus* 13, Callimachus highlights both aspects of the relationship, commemoration and re-creation. In the process he both assimilates himself to and distances himself from his predecessor.

Iambus 1, Callimachus' Hipponax: Unveiling of Voice and Audience

At the heart of *Iambus* 1 is the speaker's narrative of Bathycles' cup, a parable drawn from archaic Ionia, the world of Hipponax. The speaker

13. On this characteristic see esp. P. Bing, "The *Bios*-Tradition and Poets' Lives in Hellenistic Poetry," in *Nomodeiktes: Greek Studies in Honor of Martin Ostwald,* ed. R. M. Rosen and J. Farrell (Ann Arbor, 1993), 619–31.

relates this parable in the setting of contemporary Alexandria, the world of Callimachus. From the opening of the poem Callimachus evokes both worlds, one present, one both temporally and geographically distant, and he keeps both worlds before his audience. The poet reveals the confluence of the two gradually, through a process of unveiling of both speaker and audience, which includes a series of surprises. Only gradually do we realize where we are, who is speaking, and to whom he speaks.

> ’Ακούcαθ’ ’Ιππώνακτοc· ιοὐ γὰρ ἀλλ’ ἥκω
> ἐκ τῶν ὅκου βοῦν κολλύιβου πιπρήcκουcιν,
> φέρων ἴαμβον οὐ μάχην ἰαείδοντα
> τὴν Βοὐπιάλειον [.]. νά. [. . . ἄ]νθρωποc
>
> Listen to Hipponax. For indeed I have come
> from the place where they sell an ox for a penny,
> bearing an *iambus* which does not sing
> of the Bupalean battle [.]. νά. [. . .] man

In the opening four lines Callimachus achieves something of a *tour de force* in the creation of a poetic persona, specifically that of the iambic poet. For with the initial imperative, ’Ακούcαθ’ ’Ιππώνακτοc, it is unclear that this may be a voice other than that of the archaic poet. Indeed the first line on its own, extant in another context,[14] was long attributed to Hipponax.[15]

Almost every syllable in the first two lines serves to deceive the audience. The use of direct second person address is a typical feature of all poetry that evokes the image of a public audience; including epigram, didactic epic, and others, including iambic poetry.[16] Self-reference, as in the opening line, is a remarkable feature of the poetry of Hipponax,

14. See Pfeiffer ad loc.

15. Masson (1962) includes this line in his edition of Hipponax, pp. 57 and 101; West fr. *1 and Degani fr. dub. 187, following Pfeiffer, do not. See O. Vox, “Sul Giambo I di Callimaco,” *Rudiae* 7 (1995): 275.

16. The use of the verb ἀκούω in second person address is common in the fragments of archaic iambic (e.g., Archil. frr. 115.2, [168.4] W., Susarion fr. 1 W.), where it reenforces the oral / aural setting which the genre evokes. We find it elsewhere in the *Iambi:* 5.2 ἄκουε τἀπὸ καρδ[ίηc [hear that from my heart], 4.6 ἄκουιε δὴ τὸν αἶνον [indeed hear the fable], and further elsewhere in Hellenistic iambic (e.g. Phoenix fr. 1.13, Hermeias fr.1.1 ’Ακούcατ’, ὦ Στώακες, ἔμποροι λήρου [Hear me, Stoics, merchants of foolishness], where it reenforces the occasionality of archaic iambic). The Phoenix fragment is an important parallel in a number of ways to *Iambus* 1, including the direct address:

> ῞Ακουcον, εἴτ’ ’Ασσύριος εἴτε καὶ Μῆδος
> εἶc ἢ Κοραξός, ἢ ’πὸ τῶν ἄνω λιμνῶν
> ⟨Σ⟩ινδὸc κομήτης· οὐ γὰρ ἀλλὰ κήρυccω·

and striking for its frequency even in the surviving fragments.[17] Above all the choliambic meter would, especially when taken with the authorial self-reference, leave little doubt in the audience that the speaker is Hipponax.[18] Smaller details in the second line also suggest Hipponax as author. The plea of acute poverty is a constant feature of the poetry of Hipponax. Poverty characterizes Hipponax' self-portrayal as a thief, his frequently familiar relationship with the god Hermes, and his references to cold, to hunger, and to the deprivation of his surroundings.[19] Frequent also in Hipponax are images of money or theft and of the clothing and food that money can obtain. Characteristic too of Hipponax, and other iambic poets, is the reference simply to physical objects.[20] This is especially true of physical objects of an everyday or commonplace nature, as here there are references to an ox and a small coin.[21]

It is only in the third and fourth lines of the poem that the image of an *iambos* that does not sing of the "Bupalean battle" makes the audience aware of the unusual nature of the opening of the work.[22] These

---

ἐγὼ Νίνος πάλαι ποτ' ἐγενόμην πνεῦμα,
νῦν δ' οὐκέτ' οὐδέν, ἀλλὰ γῆ πεποίημαι.

Phoenix fr. 1.13–17 Powell

Listen, whether you are Assyrian, or Median
or Koraxian, or long-haired Sindian
from the upper marshes. For I publicly proclaim.
I, Ninus, was once long ago breath,
but now am no longer anything but earth.

These lines have drawn much attention for their similarity to *Iambus* 1; see G. A. Gerhard, ed., *Phoinix von Kolophon: Texte und Untersuchungen* (Leipzig, 1909), 188–189, Clayman (1980) 67–69. Striking too are the differences. The speaker in the first line of Phoenix fr. 1 draws a clear distinction between himself and his subject, 'Ανὴρ Νίνος τις ἐγένετ', ὡς ἐγὼ 'κούω | 'Ασσύριος, ὅστις εἶχε χρυσίου πόντον. He establishes a clear differentiation between the poetic voice of the narrative frame (ἐγώ) and the speaker of the first lines of the song of Ninus, even though there is an intended mysterious irony in the identification of the latter. See further Vox (1995) 277–78 for Aesopic parallels.

17. e.g. frr. 32.4 W. (42 Deg.), 37 W. (46 Deg.), *117.4 W. (196.4 dub. Deg.).

18. On the choliambic line cf. esp. Masson (1962) 21–28.

19. On thievery, see Hippon. fr. *1 W. (17 Deg.); on Hermes, Hippon. frr. 32, 34 W. (42, 43 Deg.); on his physical circumstances, Hippon. frr. 13 W., 36 W., 39 W. (21, 44, 48 Deg.).

20. Many of the objects, especially those with apparently foreign names, which appear in these lines of Hipponax may understandably strike the modern reader as exotic. Cf. however Masson (1962) 31–32, who argues persuasively that a certain number of the foreign words employed by Hipponax would simply have entered into the contemporary language of Ephesus. Such a use of foreign names in the iambic poetry of Greek Asia Minor might reflect rather the unelevated nature of the genre.

21. West (1974) 28–29.

22. There may indeed be something of a hint already of this unexpected turn in the repetition βοῦν ... Βουπιάλλειον.

lines serve a twofold purpose in providing a reference to the kind of invective for which Hipponax became celebrated,[23] and at the same time a rejection of that invective. The speaker continues to invoke the image of Hipponax and of Hipponactean verse with the words φέρων ἴαμβον. At the caesura, however, a change in sense intervenes, and the *iambos,* the metrical type associated more than any other with the language and imagery of personal invective, is characterized as οὐ μάχην ἀείδοντα, [not singing of a battle]. The phrasing φέρων ἴαμβον . . . ἀείδοντα is itself remarkable, if not entirely without parallel; the speaker himself does not sing, rather it is the *iambos* that the speaker brings with him from the underworld that sings. Transference of this type is not peculiar to Callimachus,[24] and we need not understand these words as a reference to a written text per se, yet the image remains an arresting one.[25] Particularly striking, however, is the negation. The audience is left with a moment of uncertainty, not knowing to which "battle" this refers.[26] Only with the opening of the fourth line of the poem, with the specific epithet Βουπάλειος, is the μάχη identified at once as the invective of Hipponax and as a departure from that invective. For it is precisely this type of invective, poetry in iambic meter that serves to do battle against Bupalus, that the speaker of these lines declares to not be his. The phrase μάχην . . . Βουπάλειον serves a further and artistically rather ingenious end. Although the adjective Βουπάλειος is attested elsewhere, it can be understood in this context as at once a reference to Bupalus, the vic-

23. For Bupalus see Hippon. frr. *1, 12.2, 15, 84.18, 95.3–4, 95a, 120, 136 W. (17, 20, 18, 86, 98, 19, 121, 144 Deg.). For the identification of Hipponax' verse particularly as invective against Bupalus, and on the testimonia on Bupalus and Athenis see above n. 3. cf. Hor. *Epod.* 6.13–14 *qualis Lycambae spretus infido gener* | *aut acer hostis Bupalo* [just as the scorned son-in-law of perfidious Lycambes, or the keen enemy of Bupalus].

24. Cf. Pindar *P.* 2.3–4: ὕμμιν τόδε τᾶν λιπαρᾶν ἀπὸ Θηβᾶν φέρων | μέλος ἔρχομαι ἀγγελίαν τετραορίας ἐλελίχθονος [to you I come from shining Thebes bearing this song, and its news of the four-horse chariot which shakes the earth].

25. Cf. the more conventional image Callimachus employs at the end of *Iambus* 2.15–17, which highlights the unusual quality of the "*iambus* not singing of a battle": ταῦτα δ' Αἰϊςωιποc | ὁ Καρδιηνὸc εἶπεν, ὅντιν' οἱ Δελφοί | ᾄδοντα μῦθον οὐ καλῶc ἐδέξαντο. Cf. Vox (1995) 275, and Hunter (1997) 47 on a possible militaristic aspect of the Callimachean image, and the suggestion of the latter that Callimachus may be evoking here an "etymological" link between ἴαμβος and ἰάπτειν.

26. Hutchinson (1988) 50, n. 51 perceives this departure from traditional Hipponactean invective: "Fr. 191. 3f. [. . .] must mark the paradox for the reader, even if such a point was not part of the rhetorical surface." Hutchinson does not, however, differentiate between the figure of Hipponax and an Hipponactean poetic persona used by Callimachus. Dawson (1950) 22–23 also perceives a departure, although he would still see this as enclosed in a polemical spirit and tone of the poem. For similar effect cf. e.g. Stesichorus' *Oresteia* fr. 210 Davies Μοῖcα cὺ μὲν πολέμουc ἀπωcαμένα πεδ' ἐμεῦ | κλείοιcα θεῶν τε γάμουc ἀνδρῶν τε δαίταc | καὶ θαλίαc μακάρων, *Anacreontea* 2.1–2 W. Δότε μοι λύρην Ὁμήρου | φονίης ἄνευθε χορδῆς.

tim par excellence of Hipponax's invective, and at the same time to the Hipponactean oeuvre as a whole.[27] The speaker who presents himself so assertively in the opening lines of Callimachus' first *Iambus* announces that his is both the voice of Hipponax and is not, that those who are to attend to his words are to hear Hipponax, but not the verses of Hipponax.[28] Callimachus develops this announcement through a line by line progression from ambiguity to revelation.

Some degree of ambiguity in the identity of the poetic voice is not unusual in Callimachus' poetry, and is a remarked-upon characteristic of several of his hymns (particularly 1, 5, and 6). It is also the case that the assumption of different personae by the iambic poet is a part of the stock-in-trade of the genre.[29] Yet Callimachus' fashioning of a poetic voice at the beginning of *Iambus* 1 is innovative. For he does not assume the persona of a typical character of iambic poetry, but of one

27. We may compare this use of manipulation of "title" as both specific example and emblematic of an author's entire oeuvre with *Aetia* fr. 1.9–12:

. . . . .]. . ρεην̣ [ὀλ]ιγόcτιχοc· ἀλλὰ καθέλ[κει
. . . . πο]λὺ τὴν μακρὴν ὄμπνια Θεcμοφόρο[c·
τοῖν δὲ] δ̣υ̣οῖν Μίμνερμοc ὅτι γλυκύc, αι̣ἱ κατὰ λεπτόν
. . . . .] ἡ μεγάλη δ' οὐκ ἐδίδαξε γυνή.

. . . . .]. . ρεην of few lines. But the bountiful Demeter
. . . . outweighs by far the long [woman?].
Of the two, the fine-scale taught that Mimnermus is sweet
. . . . . and not the large woman.

Cf. also *Aetia* fr. 75.75–77:

ξυγκραθέντ' αὐταῖc ὀξὺν ἔρωτα cέθεν
πρέcβυc ἐτητυμίῃ μεμελημένοc, ἔ̣ν̣θ̣εν̣ ὁ π̣α̣[ι]δ̣όc
μῦθοc ἐc ἡμετέρην ἔδραμε Καλλιόπην.

mixed with them your passionate love
the old man, with a care for truth, from whence
the boy's story ran to my Calliope.

and *Aetia* fr. 112.9:

αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ Μουcέων πεζὸν̣ [ἔ]πειμι νομόν.

But I will go to the prosaic pasture of the Muses.

28. Falivene (1993) 915 has a suggestive reading of οὐ . . . βουπάλειον as metaphor.

29. Cf. West (1974) 32–33. West's notes on the adoption by the ἰαμβοποιός of different personae are especially useful: "He [the poet] may represent himself as something of a clown, he may assume a different character altogether, at least at the beginning of the performance. Archilochus can become Charon the carpenter (19), or a father speaking to his daughter. Hipponax can become a backstreet burglar or a grumpy old peasant; Semonides can perhaps become a prostitute (16) or a cook (24)." Callimachus had something of a tradition of a masked maker of iambi behind him. Cf. further G. Nagy, "Iambos: Typologies of Invective and Praise." *Arethusa* 9.2 (1976): 191–205 and *The Best of the Achaeans* (Baltimore, 1979), ch. 13 "Iambos."

of its composers, only then to further mystify his audience through the refashioning of this adopted persona.

Iambus 1 opens with a second person plural imperative. At this moment it is unclear whether the speaker addresses an interior audience of the poem itself, or whether the audience is external. Just as there is a gradual revelation of the speaker in the first lines of the poem, so there is also a revelation of the audience in the lines that follow. It is particularly unfortunate that almost nothing of the fifth line of the poem remains, which might have formed a bridge to the direct address to the poem's internal audience at lines 6–11.

ὦ]νδρες οἳ νῦν[ǀ]ṛ́επφ[
κα]τηύληϲθ' οἱ με[ǀ Διω]ṇ́υϲου
]τε Μουϲέων . α[ǀ] .'Απόλλωνοϲ
ἐϲ τὸ πρ˩ὸ τείχευϲ ἱρὸν ǀ ˩ἀλέεϲ˩ δεῦτε,
οὗ τὸν˩ πάλαι Πάγχαιοιν ὁ πλάϲαϲ Ζᾶνα
γέρων˩ λαλάζων ἄδι˩κα βιβλία ψήχει.

O men of the present day[ǀ as the?] seabirds
you are crazed at the sound of the flute[ǀ of Dio]nysus
]and of the Muses . α[ǀ] . of Apollo
here in a throng to the shrine before the wall,
where the old man who fashioned the ancient Panchaean Zeus
chatters and scratches out his unrighteous books.

The presentation of the poem's internal audience is thematically and stylistically consistent with that of the poem's speaker; in particular there is a correspondence in several features of the two presentations. The address ὦ]νδρες οἳ νῦν evokes first a temporal point, a location in time that is not that of Hipponax, but rather is meant to be contrasted with his. This phrase of address heightens the sense of paradox Callimachus has already achieved in delineating a speaker both Hipponax and not Hipponax.

The use, probably appositional, of the noun ṛ́επφ[οι and of the verb καταυλέω are the first strokes with which the speaker delineates the character of this internal scene and begins to give it its tone, its descriptive quality, its sense almost of pictorial composition. These are also the first terms of contention that the speaker directs to the poem's internal audience. κέπφοι are seabirds (perhaps petrels) which are, especially in Aristophanes,[30] symbols of foolish human behavior. Here

30. Cf. Ar. *Peace* 1067–68 καὶ κέπφοι τρήρωνες ἀλωπεκιδεῦσι πέπεισθε, ǀ ὧν δόλιαι ψυχαί, δόλιαι φρένες[and shy petrels, you trust in young foxes, whose souls are deceitful, whose minds are deceitful] and the scholion to these lines εὔηθες ζῷον ὁ κέπφος, [the petrel is a silly animal].

the image is the first of a series of mindless, "swarming" activities, an image that the speaker takes up again later in the introductory frame of the poem.[31] The verb καταυλέω characterizes those who are influenced, even overpowered, by the sound of the flute.[32] Like κέπφοι, this term evokes images of irrational behavior, images that contrast strongly with the stark figure of Hipponax in this poem[33] and that we find elsewhere in the Hellenistic tradition.

There is, further, a significant Callimachean aspect in the presentation of the "opponents," which differs from such presentations in Hipponax, and which further distinguishes these lines of a Hipponactean poetic voice from Hipponax. The typical victim of Hipponax' invective is a single individual,[34] and the tone is charged with personal rebuke. Callimachus also, it is true, depicts single personal adversaries,[35] yet even these tend to be representative of types of personality or behavior.[36]

Another Callimachean aspect of these lines is the description of an adversary, or adversaries, in terms of sound (especially unpleasant noise),[37] or in reference to the effects of sound, as here with the im-

31. We may assume that the speaker directs the term κέπφοι ἄνδρες to ἄνδρες at the opening of the line in part from the parallel of the images of other swarming creatures at lines 26–28.

32. Cf. Eur. *Her.* 871 τάχα ς' ἐγὼ μᾶλλον χορεύσω καὶ καταυλήσω φόβωι [presently I will cause you to dance and will overpower you with the sound of fear] and Bond (1981) 294 to this line, Wilamowitz (1895) Bd. 3, p. 187; Hippon. fr. 118.11 W. and comm. (Deg. 129) αὐλήσει δέ σοι, "will pipe to you."

33. An anonymous note from the Suda s.v. Χλαζόμενοι . . . γελώμενοί τε καὶ καταυλούμενοι [men of Clazomenae . . . mocked and stunned] is intriguing in this context. The verb directed to men of Callimachus' present (ὦνδρες οἳ νῦν) could be understood as well as a reference to the Clazomenae of Hipponax' era (the world of the Βουπάλειος μάχη). This would nicely parallel the implied contrast in *Iambus* 13. 11–14, 64–66 of those who now go to Ephesus with the intention of becoming composers of choliambic meter and the authorial voice of Callimachus / Hipponax.

34. Hippon. fr. 12 W. (20 Deg.) may be an exception to this statement:

> τούτοισι θηπέων τοὺς Ἐρυθραίων παῖδας
> ὁ μητροκοίτης Βούπαλος σὺν Ἀρήτηι
> †καὶ ὑφέλξων τὸν δυσώνυμον † ἄρτον
>
> with these, deceiving the sons of Erythrae
> Bupalus, who bedded his mother, with Arete
> and about to draw back the unspeakable[?]

Although even in these lines the person who serves as the central object of abuse appears certainly to be Bupalus.

35. E.g. Euthydemus in *Iambus* 3, the γραμματοδιδάσκαλος (named Apollonius or Cleon by the Diegesis) of *Iambus* 5.

36. *Iambi* 2 and 13. Cf. *Aetia* fr. 1 (*the Telchines*), *Ep.* 28 Pf. (2 G.-P.). On this last see R. Thomas, "New Comedy, Callimachus, and Roman Poetry," *HSCP* 83 (1979): 179–206.

37. Hipponax may also have used sound imagery in a similar way; cf. fr. 79.11 W. (79 Deg.) ὡς ἔχιδνα συρίζει [hisses like a snake].

age of the κ̣έπφ[οι (line 6), κα]τηύληcθ' (7), and λαλάζων and ψήχει (11). So the poet characterizes his opponents in the *Aetia* prologue (fr. 1.1 Pf.) by the unpleasant sound they make (ἐπιτρύζουcιν); later in the same fragment he likens the sound of a hypothetical opponent to the braying of an ass.[38] In a different way sound has a central role in echo in Callim. *Ep.* 28 Pf. (2 G.-P.); it is the echo which reports the boy Lysanies' infidelity.[39]

The number of divine figures and the particular configuration of divine figures in these early lines of *Iambus* 1 are striking. These are lines that establish a dichotomy of speaker / audience, chastiser / chastised, true poet / false intellectual figures. Dionysus appears in two of Calli-

38.

ἐνὶ τοῖc γὰρ ἀείδομεν οἳ λιγὺν ἧχον
τέττιγοc, θ]όρυβον δ' οὐκ ἐφίληcαν ὄνων.
θηρὶ μὲν οὐατόεντι πανείκελον ὀγκήcαιτο
ἄλλοc, ἐγ]ὼ δ'εἴην οὐλ[α]χύc, ὁ πτερόειc,
ἆ πάν]τωc, ἵνα γῆραc ἵνα δρόcον ἢν μὲν ἀείδω
πρώκιο]ν ἐκ δίηc ἠέροc εἶδαρ ἔδων,
αὖθι τ]ὸ δ' ι̣ἐκ]δύοιμι ι̣]

Callim. fr. 1.29–35

For among those I sing who love
the cicada's clear sound, not asses' noise.
Let another bray all like the long-eared beast,
but I would be the fine, the winged one,
yes, in every way, that I may sing
living on dew, on the dew from the divine air,
and that I might shed forthwith old age . . .

In the poet's citation of his own words to his opponents in the same fragment (lines 7–20) the effects of sound are also central. For the lacuna at the end of line 7 φῦλον α[, P. Bing, "The Voice of Those Who Live in the Sea: Empedocles and Callimachus," *ZPE* 41 (1981): 35 n.8 has argued for Wilamowitz' conjecture, φῦλον ἄμουcον, a metaphor that in its very allusion to the lack of a muse, to a lack of sound, is a reference that draws attention to the effects of sound. Lines 19–20 are remarkable in this context:

μηδ' ἀπ' ἐμεῦ διφᾶ]τε μέγα ψοφέουcαν ἀοιδήν
τίκτεcθαι· βροντᾶ]ν οὐκ ἐμόν, ι̣ἀλλὰ̣] Διόc.'

demand not from me to produce a song which makes
great noise. To thunder is not my task, but Zeus'."

The noun ψόφοc and the denominative verb ψοφέω are used especially of hollow, empty noise; cf. LSJ, s.v. ψοφέω I.2 and ψόφοc (where the examples from Aristotle's zoological works are particularly useful). The phrase ψοφέουcα ἀοιδή thus provides an effective paradox, for the source of ψόφοc can by definition not be the source of song, and especially not of song that may be characterized as λιγύc. Great noise, as it were, is for the gods.

39. Recent treatments of this epigram include L. Koenen, "The Ptolemaic King as a Religious Figure," in *Images and Ideologies: Self-Definition in the Hellenistic World,* ed. A. W. Bulloch, E. S. Gruen, A. A. Long, and A. Stewart (Berkeley, 1993), 84–89, Cameron (1995), 387–402, Gutzwiller (1998) 218–22.

machus' epigrams in his role of the god associated with poetic victory. The reference to the Muses and Apollo at line 8 is the first of many to the gods frequently associated with poetic inspiration in the *Iambi* and elsewhere in Callimachus' poetry.[40] The Muses appear elsewhere in *Iambus* 1 at lines 17 Μοῦcα [Muse] and 92 μοῦνοc εἶλε τὰc [Μο]ύcαc, [alone took the Muses]. Apollo appears again in apostrophe at line 26 ἄπολλον, ὦινδρεc, ὡc | παρ' αἰπόλῳ μυῖαι | ἢ cφῆκεc | ἐκ γῆc ἢ ἀπὸ θύματοc Δελφ[οί, | εἰλῃδὸν [ἐc]|μεύουcιν [O Apollo, the men, as flies by a goatherd, or wasps from the ground, or Delphians from a sacrifice they swarm in droves.] Apollo and the Muses frequently appear together elsewhere as witnesses of the Callimachean poetic voice and as a source of validation for its utterances, especially at moments of aesthetic definition.[41] The first two books of the *Aetia* provide a series of elaborate, dramatic renditions of this role of Apollo and the Muses. The poet represents his initiation in the prologue to the *Aetia* (fr. 1 Pf.) as occurring through the instruction of Apollo.[42] He alludes to the Muses several times in this context as those to whom he, the poet, is dear (φίλοc), and his opponents are not (lines 2, 24, 37). Callimachus constructs the first two books of the *Aetia* through an artistic frame of dialogue between himself and two or more Muses. This dialogue structure effects, in part through its traditional language and imagery of poetic inspiration, a validation of the poet's pronouncements and etiological definitions. The epilogue to the *Aetia* (fr. 112 Pf.), which serves both as a structural and thematic bridge to the book of the *Iambi,* also highlights the close bond of poet and the Muses as source of his inspiration, a bond that transcends generic bounds, as Callimachus emphasizes with the words (fr. 112.9 Pf.) αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ Μουcέων πεζὸν [ἔ]πειμι νομόν.

As line 6 of *Iambus* 1 provides a temporal setting that develops a contrast with that of the poet Hipponax, so lines 9–11 provide a spatial one. The characters whom the speaker addresses hasten to the tem-

40. E.g. *Iambus* 13.1 Μοῦcαι καλαὶ κἄπολλον, οἷc ἐγὼ cπένδω [Fair Muses and Apollo, to whom I make my libation]. Cf. *Iambus* 3.1 Εῐ]θ' ἦν, ἄναξ] ὦπολλον, ἡνίκ' οὐκ ἦα [O would, Lord Apollo, I were, when I was not], 38–39 νῦν δ' ὁ μάργοc ἐc Μούcαc | ἔνευcα [but now a horny madman I have inclined to the Muses].

41. On the development of the *topos* of Apollo and the Muses in an inspirational / didactic role see esp. G. Lanata, ed., *Poetica Pre-Platonica* (Florence, 1963) in her commentary, passim.

42. On the poetic initiation of Callimachus and the imagery of initiation in his work see W. Wimmel, *Kallimachos in Rom: Die Nachfolge seines apologetischen Dichtens in der Augusteerzeit* (Wiesbaden, 1960), 233–50, A. Kambylis, *Die Dichterweihe und ihre Symbolik: Untersuchungen zu Hesiodos, Kallimachos, Properz, und Ennius* (Heidelberg, 1965), ch. 3 "Kallimachos," H. Reinsch-Werner, *Callimachus Hesiodicus: Die Rezeption der hesiodischen Dichtung durch Kallimachos von Kyrene* (Berlin, 1976) 308–11.

ple, which our fragmentary text specifies only with the words τὸ πρ̣ὸ τείχευc ἱρὸν. The Diegesis (VI 3–4) identifies this temple as the "temple of Sarapis, called that of Parmenio." The location and exact identification of this temple have posed a problem for the scholarship on this poem for some time.[43] Leaving aside the problem of the identification, however, what is significant here is the evocation of a setting in Alexandria, not Ephesus.

The reference to Euhemerus at lines 10 and 11 establishes a more specific temporal setting for the poem.[44] Euhemerus served under Cassander in the years 311–298 B.C.E., and as a result of his philosophical stance on the gods earned the epithet ἄθεος. This association of the audience with a figure known for his godlessness is, of course, not coincidental. The speaker draws the names and images of Olympian and Chthonic deities to himself, not to his opponents.

A correction in the text of the Diegesis is relevant, if slightly problematic, here for the identification of the audience and for the association with Euhemerus. The Diegesis (Dieg. VI 3) has φιλοcοφουc corrected to φιλολογουc. There are those who still question this correction, and there are cogent arguments on both sides of the issue. φιλόσοφοι first of all may denote "learned men" in a broad sense, not only "philosophers." A good parallel of this usage in a contemporary of Callimachus is Herodas *Mime* 1.29, where φιλόσοφοι appear in a catalogue of Alexandria's attractions that includes the *Mouseion*.[45] There are further a number of possible allusions to philosophers in a more narrow sense in the *Iambi,* and to some philosophical (in particular Platonic) theories. On the other hand, lines 12 ff., to which we will turn shortly, seem to posit different types of poets. This would admittedly be early

43. Pfeiffer vol. 2, p. xxxix ff., D'Alessio (1996) 46, n. 31, P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (Oxford, 1972), 270–71, 735–36. For general introduction to the cult of Sarapis under the early Ptolemies see also A. Bowman, *Egypt after the Pharaohs, 332 B.C.–A.D. 642, from Alexander to the Arab Conquest* (Berkeley, 1986), 175–76, P. Green, *From Alexander to Actium: The Historical Evolution of the Hellenistic Age* (Berkeley, 1990), 406–10.

We should perhaps keep in mind here that, unless (or until) new fragments to *Iambus* 1 prove otherwise, we have this identification as a temple of Sarapis from the diegete to the poem, not from the poem itself. A specific reference to a temple of Sarapis would be a definitive touch to mark the setting as not that of Hipponax (the god Sarapis being a Ptolemaic creation). Further, the presence of a true "invented" god would contrast effectively with those of Euhemerus. On the other hand, the diegete is prone to speculation in identification (cf. Dieg. VII 20–21 [to *Iambus* 5] ὄνομα Ἀπολλώνι | ον, οἱ δὲ Κλέωνά τινα, ἰαμβίζει). It is possible that the "problem" of this temple is an academic one.

Sarapis appears at Callim. *Ep.* 37 Pf. (G.-P. 17) 3–5 τῆ, κέραc τοι | δίδωμι καὶ φαρέτρην, | Cάραπι [Behold, Sarapis, to you I give horn and quiver].

44. On Euhemerus here and possibly elsewhere in the poetry of Callimachus see S. A. White, "Callimachus on Plato and Cleombrotus," *TAPA* 124 (1994): 144.

45. Cunningham (1971) 66 prefers the sense "philosophers" for this line of Herodas.

for an occurrence of the word φιλόλογοι meaning those associated with the *Mouseion* (Callimachus' "pupil" Eratosthenes is the first figure we know of who attains this classification).[46] This objection may in turn be a moot point, as classification of the audience as φιλόλογοι per se could easily be the deduction of the author of the Diegesis rather than a citation from *Iambus* 1. We may do best to say simply that the speaker of *Iambus* 1 exhorts a group for whom the figure of Hipponax works as an effective tonic, and who are discernibly of Alexandrian and not Ephesian character.

It is especially important in this regard that Euhemerus, his trip to Panachea, and his interpretation of the gods Uranus, Cronus, and Zeus as deified former kings, are points of reference not for the contemporaries of Hipponax, but for Alexandrians at the beginning of the third century B.C.E. Thus with the unflattering image of writing, of "the chattering old man who scratches out his unrighteous books," Callimachus at length reveals the actual stage-setting of *Iambus* 1. It is further remarkable in this context that it is the "books" that are "unrighteous" rather than the author (line 11 ἄδικα βιβλία),[47] just as earlier it was the *iambus* rather than the iambic poet that does not sing (line 3 ἴαμβον . . . ἀείδοντα). Both images are self-consciously literary and occur in a poem with many allusions to a literary milieu, another touch that marks the setting as other than that of Hipponax. The onomatopoetic verb ψήχει [scratches] is also very effective here, bringing with λαλάζων [chatters] a low contrast to the grandeur of the previous line. Such unappealing physical imagery is a feature of much iambic verse, which Callimachus refashions here and elsewhere in novel contexts.[48]

A number of Callimachus' hymns open with a speaker whose identity is ambiguous, and this allows the poet, as well as his audience, a number of different perspectives.[49] In *Iambus* 1 Callimachus has taken this

46. Suet. *De grammaticis* 10.4 *quia sic ut Eratosthenes, qui primus hoc cognomen sibi vindicavit, multiplici variaque doctrina censebatur.* On the evolution of the term φιλόλογος see H. Kuch, *ΦΙΛΟΛΟΓΟΣ: Untersuchung eines Wortes von seinem ersten Auftreten in der Tradition bis zur ersten überlieferten lexikalischen Festlegung* (Berlin, 1965), 28–54, R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship From the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford, 1968), 156–60. See also D'Alessio (1996) 577, n.1.

47. Cf. Callim. *Ep.* 8.5 Pf. (G.-P. 58) τῷ μερμηρίξαντι τὰ μὴ ἔνδικα [for him thinking on injustice].

48. Cf. Callim. *Iambus* 13.60–61 ἀ[λλὰ] λιμηρά | ἕκαστος ἄκροις δακτύλοις ἀ̣π̣ο̣κνίζει [but each one scrapes off famine-causing bits with his fingertips].

49. Cf. M.A. Harder, "Insubstantial Voices: Some Observations on the Hymns of Callimachus," *CQ* 86, n.5. 42 (1992): 384–94, N. Hopkinson, *Callimachus: Hymn to Demeter* (Cambridge, 1984), 3–13.

conceit a step further. The success of this carefully and self-consciously wrought conceit is of integral importance to an appreciation of the *Iambi* as a whole. For Callimachus has developed the Hipponactean persona to a more complicated level, and one concerned with the issues of a later period. The variegation of the voice of the iambic poet has here come to emblematize the variegation and complication of the genre itself.

As he prepares to leave both the physical work, the elegiac meter, and the genre of the *Aetia,* the poet in the epilogue (fr. 112 Pf.) bids farewell to his creation in a manner clearly and self-consciously Callimachean.[50] He speaks in the persona of the Alexandrian court poet,[51] the admirer and imitator of Hesiodic poetry,[52] and the singer who invokes divine inspiration to insure that he reveals truths in his work. The poetic voice is clearly that of Callimachus: it is the poet Callimachus who is the "I" of the final line turning to the "prosaic pasture of the Muses." At the opening of the first *Iambus,* however, the poet assumes a different voice, not his own, not Hipponax', but a melding of both. Callimachus configures this ambiguous poetic voice with great care, and periodically it reappears throughout the poem. Never does the speaker unmask, but remains a Callimachean Hipponax. The assumption of an ambiguous, unnamed persona is in itself not unusual in the poetry of Callimachus. The arresting feature of the poetic voice of *Iambus* 1 is that this voice is named, albeit then shown also to be a complex poetic composition of archaic invective persona and Alexandrian literary scholar. This novel poetic voice prefigures in miniature larger features of the collection: later literary composition in an archaic genre, the elevation of iambic to the level of the medium of a *poeta doctus,* and the presentation of the *poeta doctus* in the fiery guise of an invective poet.

50. For discussion of the significance of the last lines of Callimachus fr. 112 see Pfeiffer's comments to this fragment. The scholarly tradition is not unanimous in attributing the reference to the Μουcέων πεζόν . . . νόμον to the *Iambi;* this is, however, now largely the accepted interpretation. Cf. further H. Herter, "Bericht über die Literatur zur hellenistischen Dichtung aus den Jahren 1921–1935," *JAW* 64 (255) (1937): 140–44, Knox (1985) 59–65, D. Clayman, "Callimachus' *Iambi* and *Aitia,*" *ZPE* 74 (1988): 277–79, Cameron (1995) 143–62.

51. The reference at lines 2–3 μοιαδ' ἀνάccης | . . .]τερης whether to Arsinoe II Philadelphus or Berenice II Euergetes is in either case a reference to a patron specifically of Callimachus.

52. fr. 112 lines 5–6 κειν . . τῷ Μοῦcαι πολλὰ νέμοντι βοτά | cὺν μύθους ἐβάλοντο παρ' ἴχν[ι]ον ὀξέος ἵππου are clearly meant to recall fr. 2 Pf. *(Somnium)* lines 1–2 ποιμένι μῆλα νέμιοντι παρ' ἴχνιον ὀξέος ἵππου | Ἡcιόδῳ Μουcέων ἐcμὸς ὅτ' ἠντίαcεν and therewith the same attachment to Hesiod.

Interaction of Voice and Audience I (lines 12–25)

Treatments of *Iambus* 1 often omit lines 12 to 25 because of their fragmentary nature. This is certainly a mistake. A careful reading reveals two important features of the setting of this imagined scene.

The first is that the distinction between speaker and interior audience that the poet has already established appears to continue, at line 16 ἄν]δρες ὀκόσοι βο̣[and line 6 ὦ]νδρες οἳ νῦν for instance, and perhaps ὅστις ἐμ[at line 18. And there is a subsequent division of this interior audience. Lines 18–24 ὅστις . . . καὶ τὸν ὅς . . . ὅστι̣[ς . . . ὅστις suggest something of the manner of the differentiation, or cataloguing, of individuals that recurs in other *Iambi*. At *Iambus* 2.10–15 there is such a differentiation of characters who receive the voices of animals:

. . .]ψ ἐς ἀνδρῶν· καὶ κ[υ]νὸς [μ]ὲ̣[ν] Εὔ̣δημος,
ὄ[νο]υ δὲ Φίλτων, ψιττακοῦ δ̣ε̣[
οἱ δὲ τραγῳδοὶ τῶν θάλασσαν ο̣ἰ̣[κεύντων
ἔχο[υ]σι φωνήν· οἱ δὲ πάντες [ἄνθρωποι
καὶ πουλύμυθοι καὶ λάλοι πε̣φ̣[ύκασιν
ἐκεῖθεν, ὠνδρόνικε.[53]

. . .]ψ [he turned] to [the race] of men. And Eudemus has
the voice of a dog, and Philton that of an ass, and of the parrot[
and the tragedians have that of those
who dwell in the sea. And all men are both wordy and babbling
from that time, Andronicus.

and at *Iambus* 13.30–32 in the rhetorical question of genres apportioned out to different poets:

τίς εἶπεν αυτ̣[. . . .]λ̣ε. . ρ. [. . . .] .
σὺ πεντάμετρα συντίθει, σὺ δ̣᾽ἡ̣[ρῷο]ν,
σὺ δὲ τραγῳδε̣[ῖν] ἐκ θεῶν ἐκληρώσω;

who said αυτ̣[. . . .]λ̣ε. . ρ . [. . . .].
you compose pentameters, you the [heroic],
it is your lot from the gods to compose tragedy?

Both of these catalogues, as well as some of the extant vocabulary of this part of *Iambus* 1 (ἴ]αμβον,]άμετρα) suggest a differentiation of the speaker's audience here either into smaller groups of literati characterized by genre, type of discipline, or by literary or artistic approach. The parable recounted in the poem, the tale of Bathycles' cup, appears

53. These lines are followed by a reference to the ill behavior of the Delphians, which is paralleled by the greed of the Delphians at *Iambus* 1.26.

to parallel this suggestion of a differentiation of audience. The tale of the goblet that the Seven Sages bring to one another in different regions of the Greek world emblematizes a group divided by geography but united by culture, a unity the recitation of this fable is indeed meant to inspire among the factious literati of Alexandria. This passage also further distinguishes our Hipponactean speaker from the archaic poet. The self-conscious reflection of generic type in ἴ]αμβον (line 21) and]άμετρα (line 23) is a motif appropriate to the age of Callimachus rather than Hipponax.

Interaction of Voice and Audience II (lines 26–35)

Several artistic devices contribute to the vividness of the speaker's depiction of the swarming mob. Among these are (1) the juxtaposed portrayal of the addressees as a group and then one individual; (2) the juxtaposition of direct address to the whole audience and to one individual; and (3) interjection, whether in apostrophe or self-address, that has the effect of highlighting the frame in which a narrative, here the parable of Bathycles' cup, is set.[54] In these interjections Callimachus maintains his Hipponactean persona, and indeed the interjections themselves provide an opportunity for emphasizing the assumption of this persona.

The image of the swarm has a long history as a feature of both high and low poetry. The difference here is rather one of type of symbolism and of generic occasion. So the bee as a messenger of inspiration is something of a *topos* of high classical poetry,[55] and this is the image Callimachus himself uses in the programmatic end of the *Hymn to Apollo*.[56] The imagery of the wasp and the fly also has antecedents in

54. On the nature of the frame in the *Aetia* see F. Cairns, *Tibullus: A Hellenistic Poet at Rome* (Cambridge, 1979), 221–224.

55. On the bee, inspiration, and eternal life in Pindar see D. T. Steiner, *The Crown of Song: Metaphor in Pindar* (Oxford, 1986), 109, 132–33 with references; on the bee as symbol of purity (e.g. Eur. *Hipp.* 76–78) see J. H. Waszink, "Biene und Honig als Symbol des Dichters und Dichtung in der griechischen-römischen Antike," *Rheinisch-Westfälische Akademie der Wissenschaften,* Vorträge G (Opladen, 1974).

56.

> Δηοῖ δ' οὐκ ἀπὸ παντὸς ὕδωρ φορέουσι μέλισσαι,
> ἀλλ' ἥτις καθαρή τε καὶ ἀχράαντος ἀνέρπει
> πίδακος ἐξ ἱερῆς ὀλίγη λιβὰς ἄκρον ἄωτον.
>
> Callim. *Hy.* 2.110–12
>
> The bees do not bring water from every source to Deo,
> but that which, pure and undefiled, rises
> from a holy font, a small stream, the crown of water.

high literature particularly, as the *Scholia Florentina* to these lines note,[57] and in Homeric simile.[58] These images of swarming wasps, however, are regularly images of violence and anger. In Attic comedy and in the Hellenistic depictions of (especially) Hipponax the malevolent nature of the wasp occurs regularly as a metaphor for human anger.[59] The image of the swarm also occurs in the extant fragments of Hipponax himself, for example, the swarm of beetles (κάνθαροι) that appears in fr. 92.10–11 W. (95 Deg.).

Here in *Iambus* 1, however, the image of the swarming literati serves both to characterize their ethical nature and to create a visual (and perhaps also aural) depiction of the interior setting or frame in which the speaker recites the fable of Bathycles' cup.

At line 28 the speaker calls upon the Chthonic goddess Hecate, one of many references to the underworld in the poem.[60] On one level the apostrope of Hecate here underscores the journey from the world of the dead, and that the speaker is not a contemporary of the scene he is observing. The *Scholia Florentina* to these lines noted this feature

57.

] . ὦνδρε̣ι̣ς, ὡς παρ' αἰπόλῳ μυῖαι ἢ | ⟦σφῆκες·⟧
ταῦτα [π]α[ρὰ τὰ τοῦ ποιητοῦ·] | ι̣'μυιάων⟧ ἀδινάωιν ἔθνεα
πολλά' (B469) καὶ 'σφή|κι̣ε̣ς̣ς̣ι̣υν ἐοικότες ι̣ὲξεχέοντο εἰνοδίοις' (Π 259). |

Schol. Flor. (*PSI* 1094 [fr. b]) ad vv. 26/7

On Callimachus' use of these images see L. Bergson "Kallimachos, Iambos I (Fr. 191 Pf.), 26–28," *Eranos* 84 (1986): 11–16 and Falivene (1993) 918.

58.

αὐτίκα δὲ σφήκεσσιν ἐοικότες ἐξεχέοντο
εἰνοδίοις, οὓς παῖδες ἐριδμαίνωσιν ἔθοντες,
αἰεὶ κερτομέοντες, ὀδῷ ἔπι οἰκί' ἔχοντας,
νηπίαχοι· ξυνὸν δὲ κακὸν πολέεσσι τιθεῖσι.
τοὺς δ' εἴ περ παρά τίς τε κιὼν ἄνθρωπος ὁδίτης
κινήσῃ ἀέκων, οἳ δ' ἄλκιμον ἦτορ ἔχοντες
πρόσσω πᾶς πέτεται καὶ ἀμύνει οἷσι τέκεσσι.

Hom. *Il.* 16.259–65

Immediately they poured forth like wasps by the road-side,
which boys make it their habit to anger,
always teasing them, since they dwell by the road,
silly ones. For they create a common bane for many.
And if some wayfarer coming by unwittingly rouses them,
they with strong heart all fly forth, each one
and ward him off from their children.

59. On the significance of the wasp in Aristophanes' play of this name see D. M. MacDowell's commentary, 11–12 and to lines 420 ff., 1071–75, and 1102–21.

60. Bergson (1986) 15–16 sees Callimachus as reversing with the *anabasis* of Hipponax the imagery of *katabasis* poetry. See Vox (1995) 276–77, Hunter (1997) 49–50.

already in a note to line 28 εὖ τὸ τῆc ῾Ε[κάτηc]ι ὄνομα ἐπιμνησθῆ | ναι τὸν ῾Ι[ππώνα]ικτα φθιτὸν ὄντα· χθονία γὰρ ἡ [῾Εκάτη, [Hecate's name well recalls that Hipponax is dead. For Hecate is of the underworld]. This interpretation may at first appear somewhat simplistic, yet it points to an essential artistic necessity, that of maintaining the mask of the Hipponactean figure. Hecate does not appear in the extant fragments of Hipponax, although this may have to do as well with the paucity of the fragments themselves. The role of Hecate in the Homeric *Hymn to Demeter* is worth keeping in mind here. The appearance in the same hymn, and hymnal narrative of death and immortality, of Hecate and Iambe may suggest that such an association of Hecate with the jocular nature of Iambe, and by extension iambic verse, is not unusual.[61]

At lines 28–29 the speaker moves immediately from exclamation on the size of the crowd before him to iambic characterization of one intellectual figure. The stark juxtaposition creates an arresting contrast. Just as the speaker evokes the mob through similes of swarming and greed appropriate to the realm of iambic verse, so he achieves the portrayal of the individual literatus, his baldness, poverty, and cold, in traditional imagery and language (the adjective ψιλοκόρcηc, however, is an *hapax legomenon*). Callimachus uses the same telescoping effect at lines 31–33 cωπὴ γενέcθω καὶ γράφεcθε τὴν ῥῆcιν . . . ὦ λῷcτε μὴ cίμαινε, [Let there be silence and write down my tale good man, do not turn up your nose]. The transition from a generic audience (cωπὴ γενέcθω i.e. εὐφημεῖτε—addressee uncertain, general, i.e. "everyone") to a specific one (γράφεcθε τὴν ῥῆcιν—now the members of the immediate audience), and then to one selected individual[62] (ὦ λῷcτε μὴ cίμαινε) gives a far more vivid quality to a crowd through delineating figures who compose it.[63]

The imagery of writing with the phrase γράφεcθε τὴν ῥῆcιν is again noteworthy. *Iambus* 1 assumes a literary audience, and employs the imagery of the written in a manner not found in the extant body of archaic iambic: thus line 11 ἄδιικα βίβλια ψήχει, line 31 γράφεcθε τὴν ῥῆcιν, line 88 μαν]θάνοντεc οὐδ' ἄλφα. Further, the image of writing here serves to contextualize the ancient parable. Its narration might easily occur in the context of a sixth-century setting, but the writing

61. See N. J. Richardson, *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (Oxford, 1974), 213–17.

62. On the adjective cιμόc and related words see Headlam to Herodas 1.89, Gow, (1950) *Theocritus* vol. 2, 54 (to *Id.* 2.101). The goatherd of Theocr. *Id.* 3 is also characterized as cιμόc at line 8 of this poem.

63. Theocritus uses a similar kind of highlighting in the delineation of the crowd in *Id.* 15 (cf. the first stranger who all but treads on Praxinoa's robe at lines 70–73), as does Apollonius on the first appearance of Medea (see 3.247–48, and 448 ff.)

down of this parable belongs in the world of Alexandria, a world that records the culture of archaic Greece.[64]

Another poetic device that contributes to the vividness of this crowd-portrayal and the seeming spontaneity of the narration is interjection (lines 32–35). The use of interjection, whether in apostrophe, self-address, or aside to an assumed narrative audience, is a significant feature of Callimachus' poetics. Such "breakings away" can involve the assumption of a more prominent role of the assumed poetic persona, or even a momentary stepping out from this role, that is, a momentary unmasking, or perhaps a change of masks, as it were, by the poet's voice. These have their antecedents in a number of earlier poets and poetic features, particularly in the *Abbruchsformel* that is so characteristic of Pindar's style. In Callimachus the use of interjection highlights the frame in which the narrative is set. This in turn achieves a balance of frame and interior panel—the poet reiterates the frame and emphasizes the points of contact between narrative frame and tale.[65] In *Iambus* 1 the interjection also serves to recall the assumed poetic persona of Hipponax.

The pathetic allusion to the speaker's necessary return to the underworld at lines 34–35 δ[ε]ἰλμε γὰρ μέcον δινεῖν | φεῦ φ]εῦ 'Αχέρο[ντ]οc,

64. See Falivene (1993) 921–25 on models for this scene especially from Attic comedy. Falivene suggestively contrasts (ibid. 923) an Aristophanic audience of "listeners" with an Alexandrian audience of "transcribers."

65. So, e.g., at Callim. fr. 75.4–9 Pf., the conclusion and longest fragment of the episode of *Acontius and Cydippe* (*Aetia* 3), the poet interrupts his own recitation:

> Ἥρην γάρ κοτέ φαcι—κύον, κύον, ἴcχεο, λαιδρέ
> θυμέ, cύ γ' ἀείcῃ καὶ τά περ οὐχ ὁcίη·
> ὤναο κ̣άρτ' ἔνεκ' οὔ τι θεῆc ἴδεc ἱερὰ φρικτῆc,
> ἐξ ἂν ἐπεὶ καὶ τῶν ἤρυγεc ἱcτορίην.
> ἦ πολυιδρείη χαλεπὸν κακόν, ὅcτιc ἀκαρτεῖ
> γλώccηc· ὡc ἐτεὸν παῖc ὅδε μαῦλιν ἔχει.
>
> For they say once Hera—dog, dog, hold back, rash heart,
> you would sing even that which may not be spoken.
> It's to your benefit that you did not see the rites of the dread goddess
> since their story too you would have spewed out.
> Indeed much knowledge is a harsh evil for him who cannot control
> his tongue. Truly is this man a child with a knife.

He interrupts himself to fault his own narrative indiscretion, or what he perceives as a potential for indiscretion. In a setting where it is essential that the authority of the poet to recite an ἐτήτυμος λόγος [true story] be established beyond question, such a reference to both the mantic knowledge and the sense of decorum of the poet's voice serves to affirm that authority. Nor is this affirmation invoked here, just before the dramatic high point, merely incidental. The specific allusion to the poet's own πολυιδρείη [wealth of knowledge], both to its existence and to the dangers it may pose, is emblematic of the larger issue of the establishment of Callimachus' own authority as a poet.

[For alas, alas, I must whirl in the midst of Acheron], serves a dual purpose at this point in the poem. On the one hand the narrator creates a bridge with the opening of the parable of Bathycles' cup, where the old man is also on the point of the journey to the underworld, apparently again with specific reference to Acheron.[66] Such an intertextual link between narrative frame and narrated example is particularly effective in a context like this, where the fable is a moral paradigm for the setting of the narrative frame. This permeable border of narrative frame and paradigm narrated is a truly remarkable characteristic of the *Iambi* of Callimachus. At the same time the poetic fiction of the harangue to a modern audience by the long-dead iambographer is given a last emphasis before the transition to the actual narrative of the parable. This emphasis is of surprisingly paratragic tone in a choliambic poem, and proffers the same ambiguity of persona that is such a striking feature of the opening lines.

Interaction of Voice and Audience III (lines 78–98)

P. Oxy. 1011 fol. 3 contains twenty-one lines from the latter part of *Iambus* 1; four of these are complete (78–79, 82–83). Lines 86–98 are for the most part line-ends consisting of the last choliambic metron and in a number of lines part of the second. The poem in all probability did not end with line 98. Some twenty lines are missing in *P. Oxy.* 1011 between line 98 of *Iambus* 1 and line 4 of *Iambus* 2. The first three lines of *Iambus* 2, known from another source, belong somewhere in this lacuna, but how many of the missing lines belonged to each of the two poems is uncertain. It is clear, however, that the narration of the parable of Bathycles' cup has concluded by line 78, and that the poem has returned to an interaction of speaker and audience,[67] an interaction that is remarkable for the number of allusions to Hipponax' own poetry. This is all the more remarkable when we keep in mind how little Hipponax we in fact have.

The parable of Bathycles' cup itself (lines 35–77) I treat in a subsequent chapter on Callimachus' use of elevated paradigm (ch. 3, pp. 143–51). The focus of these last extant lines that follow the parable's

66. ἐς μακρὸν [ὄχθον] i.e. Ἀχέροντος coni. Livrea, "Call. Ia. I., fr. 191. 38–9 Pf.," *ZPE* 34 (1974): 46; for other conjectures for the lacuna in line 39 see Pfeiffer's comments here.

67. The parable of Bathycles' cup is, as far as we can tell, self-contained; the narrator does not, as in fr. 75, address any of the figures of the parable he is narrating. With the 2d. pers. pl. address of the final line of the Diegesis ἐ]ρίζεσθε, the speaker surely addresses his contemporary audience, and the Diegesis cites this as an explanation for the narration of the parable (cf. lines 19–20 τοιγαρ[οῦν | ἔφη]).

narration is again the creation of a poetic persona at once Hipponactean and Callimachean, and these lines continue the painting of a setting at once archaic and Alexandrian with specific touches appropriate to each.

Much of these lines consists of invective, even mutual insult, so characteristic of the iambic genre. The matricide Alcmeon (line 78 οὗτος ’Αλκμέων) is a proverbial example, as is Orestes, of violent insanity throughout Greek poetic history.[68] The fear of the raving man at line 79 'φεῦγε· βάλλει· φεῦγ'' ἐρεῖ 'τὸν ἄνθρωπον', a particularly vivid moment in this interchange, is paralleled by the image of the raving poet whom his friends constrain in *Iambus* 13,[69] and has, of course, an obvious and much-discussed Latin parallel at Hor. *Sat.* 1.4.33–38.[70] Both parallels support the suggestion that the image intended here, together with the analogy of Alcmeon, is that of the invective poet, understood

68. Cf. *Anacreont.* fr. 9 W. 3–6:

θέλω, θέλω, μανῆναι
ἐμαίνετ’ ’Αλκμέων τε
χὠ λευκόπους ’Ορέστης
τὰς μητέρας κτανόντες·

I wish, I wish to rave
as Alcmeon raved,
and white-footed Orestes
after killing their mothers.

The fragments of Euripides’ *Alcmeon* can now be found in vol. 8.1 of the Budé Euripides (ed. Van Loy and Jouan), pp. 102–12.

69. *Iambus* 13.19–21:

τ[ε]ῦ μέχρι τολμᾷς; οἱ φίλοι σε δήσ[ουσ[ι,
κ[ῆ]ν νοῦν ἔχωσιν, ἐγχέουσι τὴν [κρᾶσιν
ὡς ὑγιείης οὐδὲ τᾠνυχι ψαύεις

Until what point will you venture? Your friends will tie you down,
if they have sense, and will pour the [blending?]
as you do not touch sanity with your fingertip

70. Hor. *Sat.* 1.4.33–38:

omnes hi metuunt versus, odere poetas.
‘faenum habet in cornu, longe fuge; dummodo risum
excutiat sibi, non hic cuiquam parcet amico
et quodcumque semel chartis inleverit, omnis
gestiet a furno redeuntis scire lacuque
et pueros et anus.’

These all fear poetry, hate poets.
“Flee back, he has hay on his horn. So long as he shakes
out a laugh for himself, he will not spare any friend.
And once he has written something on his pages,
he will tell all returning from bakery and water font to learn it
both slave boys and old women.”

as Callimachus or Hipponax.[71] This suggestion is, I believe, correct, although I would emphasize that it is the Hipponactean poetic voice, the narrator of this poem, which is so characterized here, rather than Hipponax himself. The fact that both this passage in *Iambus* 1 and the corollary passage of *Iambus* 13.19–21 are cited apparently from one or more of the speaker's critics is important both as an example of Callimachus' scene-painting in the *Iambi,* and as an illustration of the socially marginalized status of the iambic poet.

There is another aspect of this citation in *Iambus* 1 that is truly remarkable, and that is the Hipponactean character of the lines. Among the fragments of the archaic poet is one in which it is Hipponax himself who is threatened with stoning (Hippon. fr. 37 W. [46 Deg.]):

ἐκέλευε βάλλειν καὶ λεύειν Ἱππώνακτα

he ordered to cast at and stone Hipponax

We might recall here also the overall prominence of images of physical violence and irrational behavior in the extant lines of Hipponax. Whether in the fragments concerned with the φαρμακός preserved by Tzetzes (Hippon. fr. 5–10 W. [26, 6, 27–30 Deg.]) or those concerned with the quarrel with Bupalus,[72] mention of physical blows, verbal insults, and a certain level of taunting abound. The audience of Callimachus' *Iambus* 1 would be aware of this Hipponactean character of these lines, and they should be read with this background very much in mind.

Another image that echoes the language of Hipponax and has also a later relevance is that of the gaping Corycean at lines 82–83 ὁ δ' ἐξόπιcθε Κω[ρ]υκαῖος ἐγχάcκει | τὴν γλῶccαν †ελων ὡc κύων ὅταν πίνῃ, [The Corycean gapes from behind (curling?) his tongue like a dog when it drinks]. This characterization of one of the speaker's addressees has a parallel in one of Hipponax' fragments preserved by Tzetzes on the φαρμακός (Hippon. fr. 9 W. [29 Deg.]):

πάλαι γὰρ αὐτοὺς προσδέκονται χάσκοντες
κράδας ἔχοντες ὡς ἔχουσι φαρμακοῖς.

for of old they awaited them gaping
holding branches as they do for pharmakoi.

71. Cf. Clayman (1980) 15.

72. Cf. esp. frr. 120 and 121 W. (121, 122 Deg.) λάβετέ μεο ταἰμάτια, κόψω Βουπάλωι τὸν ὀφθαλμόν [take my cloak, and let me punch Bupalus in the eye], ἀμφιδέξιος γάρ εἰμι κοὐκ ἁμαρτάνω κόπτων [for I have two right hands and don't miss when I strike].

The parallel functions on several levels, for there is at once a seeming intertextual link, a common evocation of the stock imagery of iambic verse, and a Hellenistic cultural relevance. The image of the opponent, whether of the poet-speaker, or, in the Hipponax fragment, apparently of the φαρμακός,[73] portrayed as "gaping" ἐγχάcκει/χάσκοντες, is one of a network of shared imagery, even if the contexts of the two images are in part difficult to discern.[74] At the same time the comparison in the Callimachean passage of the "Corycean"[75] opponent as a dog is a traditional image of invective,[76] where the characterization of an opponent as a dog is a standard one in the poetry of blame, whether in epic or iambic. There is further the added feature that for the third-century Alexandrian audience the κύων, the dog, has the connotation of aggressive *parrhesia* of the Cynic philosopher Diogenes and his followers.

Imagery of violence is, as already noted, very much at home in the iambic tradition. Both lines 86 τὰ τράȷχηλα γυμνάζει and 89 κονδύλῳ recall this tradition, as does probably line 92 εἶλε. The first of these has also two verbal parallels in Hipponax, frr. 103.1–2 and 118.7–9 W (106, 129 Deg.).[77]

x -⏑⏑]λάσας τὸν τράχ[ηλον
x -⏑]ν ἐς Μίλητον ἐξεκ[

x -⏑⏑]λάσας the throat
x -⏑]ν to Miletus ἐξεκ[

τοὺς] βρα[χίονας
καὶ τὸ]ν τράχ[ηλον ἔφθισαι,
κα[τεσθίεις δέ·] μή σε γαστρίη [λάβηι

]in your arms
]and neck [you waste away,
but you gorge.] Lest stomach-ache [overtake] you

73. There are both textual (φαρμακοῖς) and contextual (αὐτούς) uncertainties presented by this fragment; see Masson (1962) 111–12.

74. The combination of the interpretative uncertainties of the Hipponax fragment and the lacunose nature of this part of Callimachus' poem renders a contextual comparison necessarily very tentative. It is, for example, unclear whether the man characterized as Corycean at line 82 can in any way be attached to acts of violence delineated at line 79 and apparently at line 86 below.

75. On κορυκαῖος as a term of invective see Pfeiffer's commentary for parallel citations, and esp. Strabo 14.644 for the metaphorical use of the term as "eavesdropper."

76. See M. Faust, "Die künstlerische Verwendung von ΚΥΩΝ "Hund" in den homerischen Epen," *Glotta* 48 (1970): 8–31, Nagy (1979) 226–27, C. Miralles and J. Pòrtalas, *Archilochus and the Iambic Poetry* (Rome, 1983), 56–60.

77. Hippon. fr. 118 W. (129 Deg.) has striking correspondences with Callim. *Iambus* 5; it is truly regrettable that our appreciation of Callimachus' reading of Hipponax is so impeded by the state of the Hipponax papyri.

The first of these parallels is from a fragment of which the context and significance are still largely unclear.[78] The second is from the remains of a commentary to the epodes of Hipponax,[79] the context appears to be an address to an opponent of the poet who suffers from a disorder of the stomach. The self-portrayal here of Hipponax in the role of one giving, or appearing to give, "medical" advice to his opponent should be kept in mind when considering both the later delineation of Hipponax qua moralist and the persistent role of the Callimachean iambic persona in the role of admonisher / counselor. While line 89 κονδύλῳ does not have a similar parallel in Hipponax, it is, of course, common in Aristophanic comedy,[80] which may in turn have taken this in part from an integral area, imagery of physical violence, of earlier iambic verse.

With line 88 μαν]θ̣άνοντες οὐδ' ἄλφα [knowing not even alpha] Callimachus' audience returns to the world of the Alexandrian poet, and further to an immediate and specific context of the *Iambi* themselves as a collection of Callimachus' poems. This image of literacy, or lack thereof, is one appropriate to Callimachus rather than Hipponax. As the speaker of *Iambus* 1 orders the crowd of intellectuals before him to write down his speech, and as *Iambus* 5 opens with an image of teaching the alphabet,[81] so here the image evokes a cultural setting in which literacy, literature, and literariness in a broad sense are *realia* of everyday life. The striking feature of this image μαν]θ̣άνοντες οὐδ' ἄλφα here in the final lines preserved from *Iambus* 1 is that this Callimachean element is surrounded by very Hipponactean imagery. In a series of images taken from the stock of archaic iambic verse, this one stands out for the novelty of its presence in this choliambic setting—for its quality of *not* belonging. At the same time the juxtaposition of the novel iambic image μαν]θ̣άνοντες οὐδ' ἄλφα with the traditional iambic κονδύλῳ κ̣απηλεῦ̣ς[αι [to trade in blows] in the following line represents an essential feature of the *Iambi* of Callimachus overall—the inclusion in a traditionally unelevated genre of material that is not char-

78. Masson (1962) 154–55. The fragment is apparently from a poem in trimeters, perhaps choliambic, concerned with Miletus. This is one of several occurrences of this city in the fragments of Hipponax, which may be a factor in the prominence of this city in the *Iambi* of Callimachus, esp. here in *Iambus* 1 (cf. line 52]ἔπλευσεν ἐς Μίλητον, [he sailed to Miletus]) with its close Hipponactean associations.

79. For discussion of the fragments see Masson (1962) 162–66, and especially his notes for bibliography.

80. E.g., *Knights* 411–13, *Wasps* 253–54, *Peace* 122–23.

81. See my discussion of the opening of *Iambus* 5 in ch. 5. Another example of a specifically Callimachean literary image in a traditional setting is *Aetia* fr. 1.21–22, where Callimachus inserts a moment of the schoolroom into the traditional context of poetic initiation.

acteristic of iambic, and the use of iambic verse as a medium for language and thought hitherto largely foreign to it.

κ̣απηλεῦ̣ς̣[αι in the following line, however, is a stock image of iambic poetry. The verb καπηλεύω occurs in Hipponax,[82] and as a verb that denotes petty retail trade, κ̣απηλεῦ̣ς̣[αι is appropriate to the realm of iambic verse, where the trafficking in small things is frequent.[83] A similar focus on small things is the image of the Muses consuming green figs at lines 92–93 τὰ̣ς̣ [Mo]ύ̣ς̣α̣ς̣ |]. ο̣ι χλωρὰ ̣ς̣ῦκ̣α̣ τρωγού̣ς̣α̣[ς̣,[84] an image far removed from their more elevated associations with poetic inspiration, dew, and pure water elsewhere in Callimachus. This image of the "iambic" Muses is an unusual and powerful one; the divine figures who are the source of inspiration for a genre of poetry, here iambic, are themselves characterized by one of the features of that genre, the small and the unelevated. Figs and their consumption are another stock image of iambic verse which occur in Hipponax, and one example is especially noteworthy.[85]

82. Cf. Hippon. fr. 79.17–20 W. (79 Deg.):

ὁ δ' αὐτίκ' ἐλθιὼν σὺν τριοῖσι μιάρτυσιν
ὅκου τὸν ἔρπιν ὁ σκότος καπηλεύει,
ἄνθρωπον εὗρε τὴν στέγην ὀφέλλοντα—
οὐ γὰρ παρῆν ὄφελμα—πυθμένι στοιβῆς.

And he straightway going with three witnesses
where the "dark one" plies his cheap wine,
and found a man sweeping the roof with—
for there was no broom—the bottom of a bramble-bush.

The unusual word ἔρπις, apparently designating an imported Egyptian wine of mediocre quality, has been the subject of extensive scholarly debate; see Masson (1962) 148. The general level and tone in which καπηλεύει occurs are clear; as Masson observes "le verbe καπηλεύειν semble indiquer une nuance défavorable, qui correspond au ton général du passage." As an example of some of the typical features of archaic iambic this passage is quite instructive. See L. Soverini, "Parole, voce, gesto del commerciante nella Grecia Classica," *ASNP* 3d ser. 22.3 (1992): 865–68.

83. Hence in Hdt. 3.89.3 the startling characterization of Darius as κάπηλος, [retail-dealer]. In the context of a historical description of a ruler, the linking of an epithet so out of place is arresting. Here too in Herodotus, albeit in a different genre, tone and decorum are still very much at issue. I owe this observation especially to helpful discussion with L. V. Kurke.

84. Cf. further G. Tarditi, "Le Muse Povere (Call. *Ia.* I, fr. 191, 92–93 Pf.)," *Studi in Onore di Anthos Ardizzoni* (Rome, 1978) 1013–21, although the biographical conclusions he draws here seem to me exaggerated—acute poverty is a characteristic of the poetic personae of several genres, but especially iambic poetry and Roman satire. The characterization of the Muses at the epilogue to the *Aetia* (fr. 112 Pf.) αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ Μου̣ς̣έων πεζὸν [ἔ]πειμι νομόν should also be recalled here. Cozzoli (1996) 131–40 has a thorough discussion of this image and its possible interpretations. There is a similar convolution of levels in the figure of Tragedy in Aristophanes' *Frogs* 939–43 being put on a slimming regimen.

85. Cf. also frr. 48 W. (52 Deg.) συκῆν μέλαιναν, ἀμπέλου κασιγνήτην [dark fig, sister of the vine], 167 W. (177 Deg.) συκοτραγίδης [fig-guzzler].

ὥστε χρὴ σκάπτειν
πέτρας ὀρείας, σῦκα μέτρια τρώγων
καὶ κρίθινον κόλλικα, δούλιον χόρτον.
Hippon. fr. 26.3–6 W. (Deg. 36)

so as to have to dig
at mountain rocks, eating a few figs
and coarse bread from barley, the fodder of slaves.

Ardizzoni sees here at line 93 a direct allusion to this fragment of Hipponax: "v. 93 χλωρὰ σῦκα τρωγούσας riecheggia chiaramente Ipponatte 39, 5 D [26 W.] σῦκα μέτρια τρώγων."[86] While this proposal is an attractive and suggestive one, it precludes the possibility of a common use of stock imagery, as well as the possibility that this image of "eating green figs" may have appeared elsewhere in verses of Hipponax now lost to us. Indeed figs are typical τρωγάλια [sweetmeats] on the comic stage and elsewhere. In other words it is wise here as elsewhere in considering close verbal and thematic associations between the two poets to draw a clear distinction, when possible, between parallel and allusion.[87] What is nonetheless remarkable is the parallel, among so many, found in these lines of Callimachus' *Iambus* 1 and the poorly preserved fragments of his predecessor.

The last lines of our poem, not, probably, its end but a last section, recall once more the poem's setting of speaker and audience (e.g. line 95 μὴ] πίθηcθε), and the speaker's journey from a distant place. I think Pfeiffer must be right that in line 97 the expression κἀποπλεῖν ὥρη [the hour to sail away] refers to the return of the poetic voice to Hades. The phrase τοῦ Χάρωνοc in the previous line supports this interpretation, as well the similar metaphor at 34–35 δ[ε]ῖ|με γὰρ μέcον δινεῖν | φεῦ φ]εῦ Ἀχέρο[ντ]οc.[88] Throughout the poem we observe the sustained portrayal of the dead Hipponax, that is, the emphasis that the persona of the poetic voice is an artistic fiction. As the poetic voice appears to announce the arrival of the hour of his return to Hades, his audience is reminded for the third time (as at lines 1–2 and 35) in the existent frame of the poem of the speaker's journey to the Alexandrian present, and by transference, of the journey of the archaic genre of iambic poetry to a novel setting and novel level of expression.

86. "Callimaco Ipponatteo," *AFLC* 28 (1960): 8.

87. S. Hinds, *Allusion and Intertext* (Cambridge, 1998), 17–47 suggests such an outline for types of "reference" in Roman poetry.

88. Cf. Headlam-Knox to Herod. 6.98 ἡμῖν ἀφέρπειν ἐστί for parallel expressions.

TWO

On Not Going to Ephesus

Iambus 13

Callimachus concludes *Iambus* 13 with a statement at once declaratory and self-definitive (lines 64–66): "I sing, neither going to Ephesus nor associating with the Ionians, to Ephesus, whence they intending to produce the limping metra, are not unlearnedly inspired." So the poet comments on his venture in composing iambics, defining his song both in terms of a distant past and present rivals. The meter of this poem, as those of the early *Iambi,* is choliambic, the meter of Hipponax. Callimachus' later *Iambi* are remarkable for their metrical variety, but in *Iambus* 13 the poet has returned to the choliambic line. In a poem whose central concern is a defense of the poet's own "Hipponactean" verse against criticism, simply a return to the Hipponactean meter is an emphatic statement about his place in the choliambic tradition. The figure of Hipponax himself and the image of his poetry has a central place in *Iambus* 13, as in *Iambus* 1. In the earlier poem Callimachus turns to the figure of Hipponax for validation of his own voice as a choliambic poet. By using the voice of Hipponax in the traditional iambic role of the *persona loquens,* Callimachus is able, while remaining within some of the conventional practices of archaic iambic, to transfer this genre to his own self-consciously literary Alexandria. In *Iambus* 13 the figure of Hipponax is itself part of the poet's self-defense; an unnamed critic questions Callimachus' composition of choliambic verse in terms of the poet's relationship to Hipponax, and the poet concludes his response in terms of this same relationship. Hipponax, therefore, is not so much a paradigmatic figure as the center of an eristic dialogue between Callimachus and the critic. The critic questions not only the validity of the *Iambi* as individual poems, but the poet's venture into the genre. The poet responds to this criticism by turning to Ion of Chios, the fifth-century author who used many poetic forms, as a paradigm of a poet recognizably successful in several genres.

The object of aesthetic censure and critical defense in *Iambus* 13

is the composition of iambic poetry itself, and particularly the use and interpretation of the original model, in other words, the use of the past. Both *Iambi* 1 and 13 are concerned with the "placement" of the past in the present, the role of Ephesian Hipponax in contemporary Alexandria, and both poems emphasize the character of this displacement. Hipponax in *Iambus* 1 must journey from the realm of the dead to Alexandria, and as importantly must return there. The poet of *Iambus* 13 has *not* gone to Ephesus, nor mingled with the sixth-century Ionians. In both cases the displacement has obviated exact imitation. The poetic voice of *Iambus* 1 turns out to be not so much that of Hipponax as of Hipponactean verse in early third-century Alexandria. At the conclusion of *Iambus* 13 the poet gives his critic's censure, that he, the poet, has not journeyed to sixth-century Ephesus, as the reason, not why he cannot compose in this genre, but why he can. The image of the poet's journey at *Iambus* 13.64 οὔτ' . . . ἐλι̣θώ̣ν [neither . . . having gone] responds to that of *Iambus* 1.1 ι̣ο̣ι̣ὺ γὰρ ἀλλ' ἥκω, [for indeed I have come] in a moment at once definitive and conclusive.

Iambus 13 (fr. 203 Pf.)

Μοῦcαι καλαὶ κἄπολλον, οἷc ἐγὼ cπένδω
. . . . . .
]. . . [
]. . . . . [
]. cα. . . . . [
]ς διέπλευcα
]. αλευς̣ι̣νηρδ̣. [
]τριτη. ομιμν[
]δ̣ . . .χ. ουκα . [
]ω̣τεcα̣π̣λ̣. ιc[
]. . [ ]τ̣[.]ν ποδα̣βρε .[
ἐκ γὰρ. . . . . .[. οὔτ'] Ἴω̣cι cυμμείξαc
οὔτ' Ἔφεcον ἐλθών, ἥτιc ἐcτι. αμ. [
Ἔφεcον, ὅθεν περ οἱ τὰ μέτρα μέλ̣λ̣ονται
τὰ χωλὰ τίκτειν μὴ ἀμαθῶc ἐναύ̣ιονται·
ἀλλ' εἴ τι θυμὸν ἢ 'πὶ γαcτέρα πνε̣υ̣c. [
εἴτ' οὖν ἐπ̣. . . ἀρχαῖον εἴτ' ἀπ̣αι̣. ι[. .].[
τοῦτ' ἐμπ[έ]πλεκται καὶ λαλευc ι[. .]. . [
'Ιαcτὶ καὶ Δωριcτὶ καὶ τὸ cύμμικ|τ̣ο̣ν[.
τ[ε]ῦ μέχρι τολμᾷc; οἱ φίλοι cε δήc|ο̣υ̣c[ι,
κ[ἢ]ν νοῦν ἔχωcιν, ἐγχέουcι τὴν[κρᾶcιν
ὡc ὑ̣γιείηc οὐδὲ τᾧ̣νυχι ψαύ̣ει̣c
ην δητο̣c̣ωcυπιπε[. . .]. . . α̣ι̣ Μοῦ̣c̣α̣ι.'
οὕ̣τ̣ω̣c̣. . . ται κα̣[. .]. [.]ν̣[. .]. ην[.]. μ. . ·

Text: *P. Oxy.* 1011 provides almost the whole of *Iambus* 13: fol. 6r contains lines 2–33, fol. 6v contains lines 34–66. The Diegesis provides line 1. *P. Oxy.* 1011 fol. 6v 16–19 contains some additional letters which Lobel joined to lines 49–52, and which Pfeiffer gives in his Add. et Corr. I 506.

Meter: stichic choliambic.

Dialect: literary Ionic.

1 Μοῦcαι καλαὶ κἄπολλον, οἷc ἐγὼ cπένδω If the poet means to evoke a specific setting of libation, a symposium may, as Pfeiffer suggests, be the more likely. Several of Callimachus' epigrams evoke a symposiastic setting.

5 διέπλευcα The papyrus has πλευcα[ι].

10 ποδα̣βρε Pfeiffer suggests πόδ' ἄ̣βρεκ̣ [τον "unwetted foot" (cf. *Hy.* 1.19 ἄβροχοc).

12 ἥτιc ἐcτι. αμ. [Pfeiffer gives two suggestions for the last word of this line; the second is especially intriguing. "de Epheso π]αμ[φύλῳ vel π]αμ[φώνῳ v. RE V 2, 2799; sed etiam de κ]ἀμ[αζών cogitavi, cf. Et.M. 402, 9 Ἔφεcοc . . . ἀπὸ 'Εφέcου Λυδῆc 'Αμαζόνοc (Heracl. Pont. FHG II p. 222 fr. 34) et Schol. Theocr. IV 62 αἱ 'Αμαζόνεc ἐπὰν ἄρρεν γεννήcωcι, χωλὸν αὐτὸ ποιοῦcι; cf. *Hy.* 3.237 de Amazonibus Ephesi

Fair Muses and Apollo, to whom I make my libation
. . . . . .
]. . . [
]. . . . . [
]. ⟦c⟧α. . . . . [
]⟦ç⟧ I sailed across
]. αλευ⟦ç⟧ι̣νηρδ̣. [
]τριτη. ομιμν[
]δ̣ . . .χ. ουκα . [
]ω̣τε⟦ç⟧α̣π̣λ̣. ι⟦ç⟧[
]. . [ ]τ̣[.]ν ποδα̣βρε .[
for from . . . . . [neither] associating with the Ionians
nor going to Ephesus, which is . αμ. [
Ephesus, whence they intending to produce the limping
metra are not unlearnedly inspired.
But if in some regard [inspires?] heart or stomach . [
whether then ἐπ̣. . . ancient or ἀπαι̣. ι[. .].[
this is interwoven and chatter[ing?] ι[. .]. . [
in the Ionic and Doric and the intermingled fashion[.
Until what point will you venture? Your friends will tie you
down, if they have sense, and will pour the [blending?]
as you do not touch sanity with your fingertip
[it truly so much?] [. . .]. . . α̣ι̣ Muses."
thus . . . ται κα̣[. .]. [.]ν̣[. .]. ην[.]. μ. . ·

signum statuentibus." The note on the laming of male children at birth is of an even greater interest in light of the ambiguous and surely polyvalent phrase τὰ μέτρα . . . τὰ χωλὰ τίκτειν of line 14.

18 Ἰα⟦ç⟧τὶ καὶ Δωρι⟦ç⟧τὶ καὶ τὸ ⟦ç⟧ύμμικ⟦ι⟧τ̣ο̣ν[. The dialects of the *Iambi*. *Iambi* 1–4, 8, 10, 12, and 13 are composed in Ionic, *Iambi* 6, 9, and 11 in Doric, and *Iambus* 7 Doric with Aeolic features. Dawson (1950) 132 thought this last Cyrenaic; cf., however, D'Alessio (1996) 627, n. 113. The dialect of Hipponax is, of course, Ionic; that of Herodas a literary Ionic.

'ὦ λῷcτ', ἐρῆμοc[ ]. ρ ἡ ῥῆcιc
ἀκου. . . . οικε[.]. . [. . .]ῃν. . πέπλ[ον
οὐ πολλὰ [. . . .]. . λ. . . υ. ε τὰc Μούcαc
ὥcπερ λ. . . . . ε. . . . ἀπεμπολῇ κόψαc
ἐν τῳδεδο. . ρ. ολ[. .]ιν εὐρίcκειν
καλὰc ἀοιδ[ὰc]. . . . . αιρεῦνται
τίc εἶπεν αυτ[. . . .]λε. . ρ. [. . . .].
cὺ πεντάμετρα cυντίθει, cὺ δ' ἡ[ρῷο]ν,
cὺ δὲ τραγῳδε[ῖν] ἐκ θεῶν ἐκληρώcῳ ;
δοκέω μὲν οὐδείc, ἀλλὰ καὶ το . δ. . κεψαι

[9 or 10 lines are missing]

. . . . . .

]. . [.]. . [
]. φει[.]. δ. [
]φρα καὶ τραπ[
]υνον ἐμβεβ. . [
]. καὶ cὺ χωcε[
]. ε κην τομηκ[
τὰ νῦ]ν δὲ πολλὴν τυιφεδῶνα λεcχαίνειc
]ὸ τεθμὸc οὗτοc[

24 The papyrus contains a *paragraphos* in the left margin by line 24, apparently indicating a change of speaker, as Pfeiffer notes with reference to *Iambus* 4.46 ὦ πάντα καλή, τῶν ἐμῶν τὸ κ[άλλιcτον where a similar marginal sign appears to indicate a change of speaker.

24 ἐρῆμοc Perhaps "undefended" following Pfeiffer's suggestion: "fort. in sensu iudiciali (ut ἐρ. δίκη vel γραφή vel ἀγών) cum negatione: causa non indefensa est i.e. non sine defensione velut absens me damnari patiar."

24 ἡ ῥῆcιc Cf. *Iambus* 1.31 cωπὴ γενέcθω | καὶ γρἀφεcθε τὴν ῥῆcιν.

25 ἀκου. . . . Pfeiffer: "post ακου duae litterae rotundae, e.g. εc vel co: vix ακουcον L. (Lobel)." Another possibility might be a verbal adjective (e.g. ἀκουcτέα) agreeing with the nominative ἡ ῥῆcιc by analogy with the imperative in γράφεcθε τὴν ῥῆcιν at line 31 of *Iambus* 1, which this line of *Iambus* 13 seems to echo. Both passages highlight the didactic role of the speaker; for this reason too an imperative to the speaker's audience is contextually appropriate.

25 πεπλ[πέπλ[ον, Pfeiffer's supplement; the line-ends of this and the next line then recall those of lines 91 and 92 of *Iambus* 1 (and see the note to line 27 below). Another, though somewhat less attractive, possibility is some form of ἀποπλέω (cf. *Iambus* 1.97 κἀποπλεῖν), e.g. ἀπέπλουν or ἀπέπλευcα. There is also διέπλευcα in *Iambus* 13.5.

27 ἀπεμπολῇ κόψαc This image recalls the very Hipponactean phrase κονδύλῳ καπηλεῦc[αι of *Iambus* 1.89. Although neither ἀπεμπολή nor ἀπεμπολάω are found in the extant fragments of Hipponax, κόπτω is, not surprisingly, found with some frequency: frr. 20 W. (8 Deg.) δοκέων ἐκεῖνον τῆι βα{κ}τηρίηι κόψαι 120 W. (121

"Good man, undefended [ ]. ρ the speech
be heard . . . . οικε[.]. . [. . .]ῃν. . robe
not in many things [. . . .]. . λ̣. . . υ. ε the Muses
as though λ. . . . . ε. . . . in barter having struck
in τ̣ω̣δεδ̣ο̣. . ρ. ο̣λ[. .]ιν to discover
beautiful songs . . . . . ᾳ̣ιρεῦνται
who said αυτ̣[. . . .]λ̣ε. . ρ. [. . . .].
you compose pentameters, you the [heroic],
it is your lot from the gods to compose tragedy?
In my opinion no one, but [consider] also [this]

[9 or 10 lines are missing]

. . . . . .

]. . [.]. . [
]. φ̣ε̣ι̣[.]. δ. [
]φρα καὶ τραπ̣[
]υνον ἐμβεβ. . [
]. καὶ cὺ χωcε[
]. ε κην τ̣ο̣μ̣ηκ[
but in these things now you pratter much nonsense
] this ordinance [

Deg.) λάβετέ μεο ταὶμάτια, κόψω Βουπάλωι τὸν ὀφθαλμόν and 121 W. (122 Deg.) ἀμφιδέξιος γάρ εἰμι κοὐκ ἁμαρτάνω κόπτων. ἀπεμπολάω does occur at Herodas 7.65; this mimiambus is concerned with a cobbler, his wares, and his salesmanship, and the verb ἀπεμπολάω is very much at home.

31 πεντάμετρα i.e. elegy. Cf. Hermesianax fr. 7.35–36 Powell Μίμνερμος δέ, τὸν ἡδὺν ὃς εὕρετο πολλὸν ἀνατλὰς | ἦχον καὶ μαλακοῦ πνεῦμα τὸ πενταμέτρου.

33 κεψαι A. Ardizzoni (1960) 12, n. 8 argues for reading δοκέω μὲν οὐδείς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τόν̣δε̣ σ̣κέψαι following Pfeiffer and Lobel: "Donde appare che τόνδε σκέψαι, pressoché sicuro, e che per evitare lo spondeo nel quinto piede non rimane che corregare, come fa Knox, τόδε." The language of this line points to some type of illustration or illustrative comment in answer to the poet's own rhetorical question. The presence of the second person addressee (38 cύ, 40 λεcχαίνειc), however, renders uncertain at what point in the lines following 33 the illustration of Ion begins. Following line 33, 9 or 10 lines are missing in *P. Oxy.* 1011. It is possible that fr. 204a Pf. is part of the missing text.

36 φρα καὶ τραπ̣[Barber (1951a) 80 conjectures δί]φρα καὶ τράπ̣[εζαν. Perhaps here the text evokes the carpenter (τέκτων) mentioned at the conclusion of the diegete's summary. The extant part of 41]ὸ τεθμὸc οὗτοc[, which seems to recall the rhetorical question of 30–32, may well serve as the bridge in the poem which introduced Ion as paradigm. All in all we are perhaps on surest ground in following Pfeiffer's suggestion that 43–47 or 49 refer specifically to Ion of Chios, although he may well have been integral to the lost previous lines.

]υ̣[. .]ν κα. . ε. [
]οὐχὶ μοῦνον εξ. [
ο]υc τραγῳδοὺc ἀλλὰ κ̣α̣[. . . . .]. ν
π]εντάμετρον οὐχ ἅπαξ. [. é]κρουcε
]cερω. . . φ̣α̣υ̣λ̣α̣. . . . ουcι
Λυδὸν] πρὸc αὐ̣λὸν λ. . . . . κ̣α̣ὶ χορδάc
] · ἦν γὰρ ἐντελέc τε τὸ χρῆμα
. .]. .[.]ιραγει̣νο̣ν καὶ λ̣. . . . ἀνεπλάcθη
.]μ. [. .]ιπερημεν αἱ θεαὶ γὰρ ο̣[. .]κείνουc
.]ι̣. . νιη̣αc ἠγάπηcαν αἱ τα̣. . αυτη
.]. . ναloιδοc ἐc κέραc τεθύμωται
κοτέω]ν ἀοιδῷ̣ κὴμὲ δει. . ταπρα̣χ̣. . . [
]. δ[ύ]νηται τὴν γενὴν ἀνακρίνει
κα[ὶ] δοῦλον εἶναί φηcι καὶ παλίμπρητον
καὶ τοῦ πρ. . . . . ου τὸν βραχίονα cτίζει,
ὥcτ’ οὐκ αικε̣[. . . . .]υ̣cιν α. λ̣. . υ̣cαι
φαύλοιc ὁμι[λ]εῖ[ν. . . .]. ν π̣α̣ρέπτηcαν
καὐταὶ τρομεῦc̣α̣ι̣ μὴ κακῷ̣c̣ ἀ̣κούc̣ωcι·
τοῦδ’ οὕνεκ’ οὐδὲν πῖον, ἀ[λλὰ] λιμηρά̣
ἕκαcτοc ἄκροιc δακτύλοιc ἀ̣π̣ο̣κνίζει,
ὡc τῆc ἐλαίηc, ἣ ἀνέπαυcε τ̣ὴν Λητώ.

43 εξ . [Wilamowitz suggested ἐξά̣[μετρον which would allow three genres of Ion's poetry in lines 43–45; cf., however, line 31 ἠ[ρῷο]ν.

47 Λυδὸν] πρὸc αὐ̣λὸν λ . . . . . κ̣α̣ὶ χορδάc Cf. *Iambus* 3.36 Φ̣ρ̣ύγ[α] π̣ρ̣[ὸc] αὐλόν. Pfeiffer draws attention here to the frequent appearance of this imagery in the fragments of Ion's tragic verse. Two of these parallels occur in a satyr-play, Ion's *Omphale,* which might be expected to draw heavily on its Lydian setting:

<ΟΜΦ> ἀλλ’ εἶα, Λυδαὶ ψάλτριαι, παλαιθέτων
ὕμνων ἀοιδοί, τὸν ξένον κοσμήσατε
Λυδός τε μάγαδις αὐλὸς ἡγείσθω βοῆς

(Ion fr. 26a–b L. = *TrGF* frr. 22–23)

ἐπὶ δ’αὐλὸς ἀλέκτωρ
Λύδιον ὕμνον ἀχέων

(Ion fr. 42 L. = *TrGF* fr. 39)

48–49] · ἦν γὰρ ἐντελέc τε τὸ χρῆμα | ..]..[.]ιραγει̣νο̣ν καὶ λ̣. . . . ἀνεπλάcθη]ραγει̣νο̣ν rather than τετ]ράγωνο̣ν from *P. Oxy.* 1011 fr. 9v Hu. (see Pfeiffer Add. et Corr. I 506).

52 ἐc κέραc τεθύμωται For the image of the enraged bull behind this metaphor see Eur. *Bacch.* 743 ταῦροι δ’ ὑβρισταὶ κἀς κέρας θυμούμενοι and E. R. Dodds' notes to this line. Pfeiffer cites the two Vergilian parallels *Georg.* 3.232 *(taurus) et temptat sese atque irasci in cornua discit,* and *Aen.* 12.104 *aut irasci in cornua temptat.* The sense, as Dodds observes, is clear in Ovid *Met.* 8.882 *armenti modo dux vires in cor-*

]ῠ̣[. .]ν κα. . ε. [
] not alone εξ . [
] the (?) tragedians but rather κᾰ̣[. . . . .]. ν
] pentameter did not once strike out
]cερω. . . paltry(?) . . . . ουcι
with Lydian flute λ. . . . . and strings
] for the product was finished and
. .]. .[.]ιραγε̣ι̣νο̣ν and λ̣. . . . was formed anew
.]μ. [. .]ιπερημεν for the goddesses ο̣[. .] them
.]ι̣. . νιηαc love who τα̣. . αυτη
.]. . ναιοιδοc rage rising in his horns
angry with the singer and me δει. . ταπρᾰ̣χ. . . [
]. is able questions my birth
and says that I am a slave and one bought and sold repeatedly
and τοῦ πρ. . . . . ου brands my arm,
that not αικε̣[. . . . .]ῠcιν α. λ̣. . υc̣αι
to associate with men of little worth. . . .]. ν have flown by
and themselves tremble lest they be badly spoken of.
For which reason nothing fat, but famine-causing bits
each one scrapes off with his fingertips
as though from the olive tree, which gave rest to Leto.

nua sumo. The same image is of course the one Horace has in mind at *Sat.* 1.4.34 *faenum habet in cornu, longe fuge* (this line appears to recall both *Iambi* 1 and 13). The word κέρας has another sense in the iambic repertory, that of the male organ; see Archil. fr. 247 W. and Henderson (1975) 127 and ibid., n. 110.

54–56 The charge of low birth or dubious origin (lines 54–56) is a stock feature of iambic invective. Cf. Hippon. fr. 28 W. (39 Deg.) line 5 νικύρτα καὶ σάβαννι on one artist so deriding another in choliambics, where the implication is apparently that Mimnes is a slave repeatedly sold. On the later representation of Enipo, mother of Archilochus, as a slave see M. R. Lefkowitz, "Fictions in Literary Biography: The New Poem and the Archilochus Legend," *Arethusa* 9.2 (1976): 181–189.

60 πῖον An epic epithet meaning "fat" or "rich" which occurs with some frequency in Callimachus, usually in a context recalling this epic quality; e.g. *Hy.* 3.148 πῖον ἔδεcμα, *Hy.* 4.179 ἴδωcι δὲ πίονα καπνόν, 267 πίονεc ἤπειροί τε καὶ αἵ περιναίετε νῆcοι. Callimachus uses this epithet only in the positive sense of "rich." πίων is not Callimachus' term for "fat," which may carry the literary-critical sense of "inflated"—this is παχύς; so *Aet.* fr. 1.23–24 Pf. ' . . . . .] . . . ἀοιδέ, τὸ μὲν θύοc ὅττι πάχιcτον | θρέψαι, τὴ]ν Μοῦcαν δ'ὠγαθὲ λεπταλέην· and fr. 398 Pf. (of the *Lyde* of Antimachus of Colophon) Λύδη καὶ παχὺ γράμμα καὶ οὐ τορόν. On fr. 398 Pf. see now N. Krevans, "Fighting against Antimachus: The *Lyde* and the *Aetia* Reconsidered," in *Callimachus,* ed. M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit, and G. C. Wakker (Groningen, 1993), 149–60. See also Scodel (1987) 213.

μηθ. [. .]. . . . . ν ἀείδω
οὔτ᾽ ι᾽Εφεcoιν ἐλιθὼιν οὔτ᾽ ι᾽Ιωιcι cυμμείξαc,
᾽Εφεcον, ὅθεν περ οἱ τὰ μέτρα μέλλοντεc
τὰ χωλὰ τίκτειν μὴ ἀμαθῶc ἐναύονται.

Diegesis to *Iambus* 13

IX

Μοῦcαι καλαὶ κἄπολλον, οἷc ἐγὼ cπένδω·
᾽Εν τούτῳ πρὸc τοὺc καταμεμφομέ-
νουc αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῇ πολυειδείᾳ ὧν
γράφει ποιημάτων ἁπαντῶν φηcιν ὅτι
᾽Ιωνα μιμεῖται τὸν τραγικόν·
ἀλλ᾽ οὐδὲ τὸν τέκτονά τιc μέμφεται πολυειδῆ
cκεύη τεκταινόμενον.

34 τῇ πολυειδείᾳ "Variety of form." Plato in the *Laws* already uses the term εἶδος "kind," "class" of poetic types (700a–b). The term itself does not appear in the extant lines of *Iambus* 13. Gutzwiller (1996) 131 makes the suggestion that πολυείδεια may have "served as the *terminus technicus* for the heterogeneity that Callimachus was defending." Cf. fr. 75.8 πολυιδρείη.

not (?). [. .]. . . . . ν̣ I sing
neither going to Ephesus nor associating with the Ionians,
to Ephesus, whence they intending to produce the limping
metra, are not unlearnedly inspired.

"Fair Muses and Apollo, to whom I make my libation."
In this he says to those who fault him
for the variety of poems he writes
that he is imitating Ion the tragic poet.
Nor does anyone find fault with a builder
for creating a variety of artifacts.

Interpretation

The Singer's Fragmentary Voice (lines 1–9)

We know from the diegete's summary that *Iambus* 13 is a poem of self-defense, a declaration that responds to the criticisms of others. From the Diegesis we have the opening line, an invocation in the first person to the poet's gods. When, however, we are able to read the text of the poem itself from line 11 we find another voice, that of a hostile critic, to which the poet from line 24 responds. How this dialogue structure is originally introduced, in what setting the poet imagines it to take place, the poem's broken opening lines keep from us. Our text of *Iambus* 13 is in this way paradoxical—it is a poem that is a poetic declaration from which the opening notes are missing. We read the poem rather as a response.

The broken opening of *Iambus* 13 contains, nonetheless, a few tantalizing images that are suggestive of the characteristics of the poem as a whole. Although the first line does not specify its speaker, I believe it safe to assume that the speaker of this opening line and the broken lines that follow to perhaps line 10, is the poet and not his opponent, who is speaking at line 11 and concludes at line 22. Only the poet appears in the first person in the extant lines of *Iambus* 13 (as e.g. line 1 cπένδω [I make my libation], line 33 δοκέω [I think], line 63 ἀείδω [I sing]). This is a self-reflective poem, and one that has as its focal point the composition of the *Iambi* themselves. The ἐγώ [I], the poetic voice, is particularly context-specific. There is further an important and deliberate corollary in the first person ἀείδω of line 63; both cπένδω [I make my libation] and ἀείδω, as metaphors of poetic composition, are declarative, and both are hymnic.[1]

The opening line of this poem in choliambic meter is hymnic. A choliambic poem that opens with a hymnic apostrophe already evokes generic complexity and expectation. The poet, here with a declarative assertion of his own religious act (cπένδω), situates himself metaphorically with the divine sources of his inspiration, the Muses and Apollo.[2] It is true that elevated art forms are not the only provenance of prayers, but in opening *Iambus* 13, a poem concerned with correct or valid poetic inspiration, with a hymnic apostrophe, Callimachus both gives

1. Cf. *Hy.* 1.1 Ζηνὸc ἔοι τί κεν ἄλλο παρὰ cπονδῆcιν ἀείδειν, *Hy.* 4.1 Τὴν ἱερήν, ὦ θυμέ, τίνα χρόνον †ηποτ† ἀείcειc.

2. On the larger theme of the use of figures of divine inspiration for artistic valorization in Hellenistic poetry see Goldhill (1991) 225–46, L. Paduano Faedo, "L'inversione del rapporto poeta: Musa nella cultura ellenistica," *ASNP* 39 (1970): 377–86.

validity to his own poetic tongue and integrates the elevated imagery of poetic composition into choliambic verse. The opening line is emblematic of the whole poem.

The earlier choliambic poems (*Iambi* 1–5) open either with lines of direct address to a mortal audience[3] or with reference to another, fabled time.[4] Of the remaining *Iambi*, only *Iambus* 12 has an opening line of hymnic character: Ἄρτειμι Κρηταῖον Ἀμνισοῦ πέδον. The particular significance of the hymnic opening line of *Iambus* 13 lies in its encapsulation of the central theme of the poem. As the poet in these verses decries a confinement of one artist to a single genre, and portrays himself also as the victim of those who would denounce variegation of the poetic art, so the very opening verse is an example of such variegation—the language and imagery of traditionally high poetry in the meter of a poetry traditionally low. This aesthetic juxtaposition is the more effective for instantiating a poem in which the poet, while writing in the medium of Hipponax, the choliambic verse, at the same time clearly distances himself from those who would have him blindly imitate him.

Hipponax himself occasionally uses such juxtapositions, contrasting the imagery and diction of high and low poetry. In fr. 32 W. (42 Deg.), lines 1–2, an initially, if slightly jocular, hymnic tone evolves into a far less elevated one through the images that follow:

> Ἑρμῆ, φίλ' Ἑρμῆ, Μαιαδεῦ, Κυλλήνιε,
> ἐπεύχομαί τοι, κάρτα γὰρ κακῶς ῥιγῶ
>
> Hermes, dear Hermes, son of Maia, Cyllenian one,
> I pray to you, for truly I am shivering terribly

Hipponax juxtaposes the grandeur in the first line of fr. 32 with the images of the physicality of poverty.[5] The hymnic language and imagery the poet employs here are meant to be, as E. Degani observes, largely humorous.[6] Callimachus' use of hymnic features in the opening line

3. So *Iambus* 1 Ἀκούσαθ' Ἱππώνακτος· ιοὐ γὰρ ἀλλ' ἥκω; *Iambus* 4 Εἰῖς—οὐ γάρ;—ἡμέων, παῖ Χαριτάδεω, καὶ σύ *Iambus* 5 (composed alternately in choliambics and iambic dimeter) Ὦ ξεῖνε—συμβουλὴ ιγὰρ ἔν τι τῶν ἱρῶν—.

4. *Iambus* 2 Ἦν κεῖνος οὐνιαυτός, ᾧ τό τε πτηνόν; *Iambus* 3 Εἰῖθ' ἦν, ἄναξ ἄπολλον, ἠνίκ' οὐκ ἦα.

5. Degani (1984) 189: "infine lo scanzonato impiego degli altisonanti, aulici patronimici di tradizione epica, che conferiscono a squallidi personaggi . . . un' investitura paradossalmente, ironicamente nobiliare. . . . Sarà a tal proposito opportuno soffermarci sul sorprendente e singolarissimo Μαιαδεύς, la cui valenza comico-parodico sembra sia fin qui puntualmente sfuggita agli interpreti di Ipponate."

6. Degani (1984) 217, n. 96. The hymnic features, and especially the allusion to the opening lines of the Homeric *Hymn to Hermes* have as well another aspect here, given the role of Hermes in iambic poetry and his importance to iambic poets, and the na-

of *Iambus* 13 has a quite different effect. He both calls forth the central theme of the poem, the poet's declaration of his right to compose in a multiplicity of poetic genres, and, indeed, in a multiplicity of generic figures within a single genre, and at the same time elevates choliambic verse to a higher level.[7]

The declarative voice that opens the poem with so specific an act of artistic self-positioning then breaks off. Of lines 2–10 there are only partial remnants. Yet from these remnants we may read one word with certainty and conjecture one other. Both have great value for an interpretation of the larger poem.

The first person διέπλευcα (line 5) recalls for us the imagery of journeying integral to this poem, to *Iambus* 1, and indeed to many of the other *Iambi*. As with cπένδω in line 1 the speaker is certainly Callimachus, the narrative voice. The parallel image here is that of the speaker's journey sailing across Acheron in *Iambus* 1. In that poem Callimachus appears masked, here in *propria persona,* but in both he appears in imagery of journeying and displacement. Sailing is a common motif of programmatic poetry generally; however, the covering (or rather not covering) of temporal-spatial distance is a central theme of *this* programmatic poem, and this early image of sailing is particularly effective.

At line 7 ομιμν[Pfeiffer follows a conjectured reading of O. Crusius[8] and prints ὁ Μίμν[ερμοc, the name of the archaic elegiac poet Mimnermus. This reading has been followed in all subsequent editions and translations of the *Iambi,* and is generally accepted in the scholarship both of Callimachus' *Iambi* and of Mimnermus. Studies on the *Iambi* draw on the presence of Mimnermus in line 11 of the *Aetia* prologue (fr. 1 Pf.) as a parallel. The assumption in modern literary histories that Mimnermus was the author not only of elegiac but also of

---

ture of the hymn itself. For in a sense the *Hymn to Hermes,* with its tale of theft, cleverness, and laughter told in epic / hymnic language and meter, already contains something of a juxtaposition of genres. The importance of Hermes to iambic poets, and specifically to Hipponax, renders this contrast of high and low in the Hipponax fragment appropriate. The poor, shivering poet has also *his* deity, who is a source, rather than of inspiration alone, of more immediate, physical succor as well. Poets of all genres anticipate material benefit (see Svenbro [1976] 173–86), but the material benefits that the choliambic poet seeks are of a "baser" nature, and Hipponax calls attention to their unelevated stature.

7. There is a similar feature in some of the choliambic poems of Catullus, which appeal to a more elevated poetic value than their metrical form might at first suggest, e.g. 31.

8. O. Crusius, *Literar. Zentralblatt* (1910) 556–58. This is one conjecture among many others that Crusius proposes for the text of *P. Oxy.* 1011; he does not, however, offer any argumentation to support it.

iambic poetry is founded in large part on this conjectured reading in *Iambus* 13.

I have argued elsewhere[9] that there are significant reasons to question this conjecture, and I summarize them here. (1) Mimnermus is known in antiquity primarily as an author of elegy,[10] and is thus appropriate as a paradigm to the *Aetia* prologue. However, unlike Ion of Chios, he is not known as a poet who composed in a multiplicity of poetic genres. (2) Although the *Aetia* prologue and *Iambus* 13 may both be termed programmatic, their programmatic statements are not the same. (3) The Diegesis, which mentions Ion of Chios, does not mention Mimnermus.

D. Obbink has kindly looked at the papyrus again, and found under ultraviolet light traces of two letters which are not clearly visible to the naked eye:

τριτηι̣τομιμν[

The iota is thinner than usual and might belong to another letter or be vestigial ink; for the tau, there is a vertical descender in the middle space, consistent with the tale of a tau. We may then tentatively read:

]τριτηι τ̣ὸ μιμν[

This reading effectively rules out the conjectured name Mimnermus.

I have suggested elsewhere that we consider here a nominal adjective derived from the name Μιμνῆς,[11] the name of the maritime

9. B. Hughes, "Callimachus, Hipponax, and the Persona of the Iambographer," *MD* 37 (1996): 213–14.

10. Cf. Hor. *Epist.* 1.6.65–66 *si, Mimnermus uti censet, sine amore iocisque* | *nil est iucundum, vivas in amore iocisque* and at *Epist.* 2.2.90–101 *qui minus argutos vexat furor iste poetas?* | *carmina compono, hic elegos . . . discedo Alcaeus puncto illius: ille meo quis?* | *quis nisi Callimachus? si plus apposcere visus,* | *fit Mimnermus et optivo cognomine crescit.* On these last lines see C. O. Brink *Horace on Poetry: Epistles Book II* (Cambridge 1982), 315–16, 325–26. Other relevant characterizations from Augustan poetry are Prop. 1.9.11–12 *plus in amore valet Mimnermi versus Homero:* | *carmina mansuetus lenia quaerit Amor,* and the Ovidian corollary *Rem. Am.* 377–82 *liber in adversos hostes stringatur iambus,* | *seu celer, extremum seu trahat ille pedem.* | *blanda pharetratos Elegia cantet Amores* | *et levis arbitrio ludat amica suo,* | *Callimachi numeris non est dicendus Achilles;* | *Cydippe non est oris, Homere, tui.*" Roman poetry associates Mimnermus with Callimachus, but as an elegist, following the model of the prologue to the *Aetia.* (The fact that Mimnermus is so frequently cited as an author of elegy is the one argument which might have supported Crusius' conjecture of the poet's name at line 7 (cf. line 31 πεντάμετρα, line 45 π]εντάμετρον). There is, however, no evidence for a catalogue of poets corresponding with the poetic genres of lines 31–32.)

11. Hughes (1996) 215.

painter of Hippon. fr. 28 W. (39 Deg.) τὸ Μιμνεῖον (cf. *Iambus* 2.3 ὁ Προμήθειος), and read as the final metron of the choliambic line:

τριτηι τὸ Μιμν[εῖον

This conjecture becomes slightly more attractive when paired with the maritime image of διέπλευσα of line 5. Such a reference to one of the more celebrated aspects of the poetry of Hipponax, his biting personal invective directed against incompetent or immoral artists, would have, of course, a parallel in the μάχην . . . Βουπιάλειον of *Iambus* 1.3–4.

An objection might be raised here that Mimnes is a minor figure in the poetry of Hipponax. To this objection there is a response, at least in part. Very little of Hipponax has survived; therefore to classify a figure as "minor" is methodologically unsound. That Bupalus is better known to us as a victim of Hipponax' invective may be in part the result of a tradition that associates one figure of invective with each iambic poet (e.g. Lycambes and Archilochus). More significant, however, is a scholion to Lycophron 425, one of the sources of Hipponax fr. 28 W., which may have been modeled on the opening line of *Iambus* 1: ἄκουσον καὶ τῶν κατὰ τοῦ Μιμνῆ . . . χωλῶν ἰάμβων Ἱππωνακτείων . . . [hear also Hipponax' choliambics against Mimnes]. The scholiast, if he is indeed drawing on the opening of *Iambus* 1, apparently perceives the parallel significance of Bupalus and Mimnes.

It is, of course, possible that we should not read here a proper name at all, but perhaps an attributive participle of the type ὁ μίμνων (τὸ μίμνον), a verb Callimachus employs with some frequency.

The speaker at line 11 is apparently the poet's critic. We cannot ascertain at what point in these broken lines the role of speaker shifts from poet to critic, nor how the dialogue is initially structured. The poem opens with an asseveration of the poet's bond to Apollo and the Muses, to divine inspiration; the appropriation of this inspiration is a central issue in the remainder of the poem. From the opening lines it appears that the poet evokes both images of journeying and of sixth-century Ionia, and it is with these images that his critic now responds.

The Critic (lines 11–22)

Iambus 1 opens with the image of a poet faulting an audience for their behavior. *Iambus* 13 in turn opens with a critic faulting the poet for his compositions.

ἐκ γὰρ. . . . . .[. οὔτ'] Ἴωσι συμμείξας
οὔτ' Ἔφεσον ἐλθών, ἥτις ἐστι. αμ. [

Ἔφεcον, ὅθεν περ οἱ τὰ μέτρα μέλιλοντεc
τὰ χωλὰ τίκτειν μὴ ἀμαθῶc ἐναύιονται·
ἀλλ' εἴ τι θυμὸν ἢ ̓πὶ γαcτέρα πνεύc. [
εἴτ' οὖν ἐπ. . . ἀρχαῖον εἴτ' ἀπαι. ι[. .].[
τοῦτ' ἐμπ[έ]πλεκται καὶ λαλευcι[. .]. .[
̓Ιαcτὶ καὶ Δωριcτὶ καὶ τὸ cύμμικ|τον[.
τ[ε]ῦ μέχρι τολμᾷc; οἱ φίλοι cε δήcουc[ι,
κ[ῆ]ν νοῦν ἔχωcιν, ἐγχέουcι τὴν[κρᾶcιν
ὡc ὑγιείηc οὐδὲ τῷνυχι ψαύειc
ην δητοcωcυπιπε[. . .]. . . αι Μοῦcαι.'

for from . . . . . [neither] associating with the Ionians
nor going to Ephesus, which is . αμ. [
Ephesus, whence they intending to produce the limping
metra are not unlearnedly inspired.
But if in some regard [inspires?] heart or stomach. [
whether then ἐπ. . . ancient or ἀπαι. ι[. .].[
this is interwoven and chatter[ing?] ι[. .]. .[
in the Ionic and Doric and the intermingled fashion[.
Until what point will you venture? Your friends will tie you down,
if they have sense, and will pour the [blending?]
as you do not touch sanity with your fingertip
[it truly so much?] [. . .]. . . αι Muses."

With the creation of this unnamed literary critic, Callimachus inverts the roles of invective poet and object of invective. The critic assumes the language and imagery drawn from the repertory of the invective poet, and the poet becomes the object.[12] Particularly the charges of insanity (lines 19–21) and low birth (55–56) are standard features of this repertory. The application of these charges to an artistic creation, and, by transference, to its creator, has a model already in the poetry of Hipponax himself in the Mimnes fragment and in the testimonia on the sculptors Bupalus and Athenis. Aesthetic criticism is itself a reflection of a central characteristic of this kind of poetry, its ethical voice—iambic poetry ridicules, passes judgment, exposes. In *Iambus* 13 the critic initially takes on this role, and to this critic the poet addresses his speech of self-defense and self-definition. In effect one iambic poet responds to another.

This critic is only a voice; he is not named or in any other manner embodied in the poem. The comment of the diegete, τοὺc καταμεμφομέ|νουc αὐτὸν, is only generally descriptive, and reveals nothing of

12. There is some precedent for such an inversion in the fragments of Hipponax where the poet casts himself in the role of φαρμακός. In both the surviving trimeter and tetrameter fragments Solon frequently casts his own self-portrayal in terms of his enemies' criticisms: e.g. frr. 33, 34 W.

this figure. Generally when Callimachus composes one of the *Iambi* with an eye to satirizing a particular individual, as *Iambi* 3 and 5, these are identified by the diegete.[13] The critic of *Iambus* 13 is rather a foil, a voice to whom the poet may respond in outlining his own compositional ideals. Nor does the critical voice reveal anything of himself. Callimachus' aesthetic opponents, real or imagined, are here, as in the *Aetia* prologue, an artistic means for the poet to define himself; they are not themselves self-referential—it is only their perception of the poet and of his verses that is delineated.[14] The critical voice is rather a means for the poet to play with the positions of invective.

The critic's opening charge (lines 11–14) is a remarkable use of metaphor and juxtaposition. The phrase "associating with the Ionians" and the image of the journey to Ephesus symbolize a journey not only through geographical space but also through time to the "source" of invective choliambic verse, to the sixth-century Ephesus of Hipponax. This image of a literary journey at once spatial and temporal has, of course, a corollary in the elaborate delineation of the journey of Hipponax in *Iambus* 1, yet here the figure of Hipponax has a quite different purpose. The journey in the first *Iambus,* and for that matter the several journeys of the son in the fable of Bathycles' cup to each of the Seven Sages, serves as a paradigm of conciliation and affirmation. Callimachus assumes the guise of a Hipponactean poetic voice in part to attain a vantage of authority in entreating his fellow literati to cease wrangling with one another; their quarreling among one another necessitates his journey, which is portrayed as a source of some travail,[15]

13. So Dieg. VI 37–38 to *Iambus* 3 παρεπι̣ | κόπτει δὲ καὶ Εὐθύδημόν τινα and Dieg. VII 20–21 to *Iambus* 5 Γραμματο[δ]ι̣δάcκαλ[ο]ν, ὄνομα Ἀπολλώνι | ον, οἱ δὲ Κλέωνά τινα. In *Iambus* 3 Callimachus refers to Euthydemus by name (line 24); the grammar teacher of *Iambus* 5 is not mentioned in the remaining verses of the poem.

14. This is the case in the *Aetia* prologue even if, following the *Scholia Florentina,* we may identify among those Callimachus characterizes as Τελχῖνες the poets Aesclepiades, Posidippus, and the philosopher Praxiphanes. These figures, we should remember, are identified as the poet's opponents in the scholia, not in the poem of Callimachus. It is, I believe, unnecessary to attempt an identification of the opponents in *Iambus* 13, and certainly to include Herodas among them. Clayman (1980) 47 cautiously observes, "It is impossible to say whether Callimachus is answering criticism which had actually been leveled against some of the *Iambi* already in circulation, or whether he is posturing here—setting up his defense before the critics could get started." I would take this caution a step further. In order to present a *recusatio,* and *Iambus* 13, like the *Aetia* prologue, is such a *recusatio,* the poet needs to give the impression of opposing demands, whether those of hostile criticism, or those simply of a demand for a kind of work other than that which the poet himself seeks to compose. The poetry of *recusatio* is a particular kind of program poetry in that it presents itself as the answer to a demand, and hence inherently needs the foil of this demand.

15. *Iambus* 1.34–35 δ[ε]ῖ̣με γὰρ μέc̣ον δινεῖν | φεῦ φ]εῦ Ἀχέρο[ντ]οc̣-.

yet necessitated by circumstance.[16] The images in both poems are of temporal and spatial journeys and displacement. "Hipponax" in *Iambus* 1 does journey across Acheron to third-century Alexandria; in *Iambus* 13 the poet rejects the journey to Hipponax, to Ionian Ephesus as the source of inspiration for the writer of invective. The critic charges here at lines 11–14 that this journey has not been accomplished, and this charge the poet both affirms and dramatically appropriates by repeating these lines in the final part of the poem (lines 64–66).

Line 14 τὰ χωλὰ τίκτειν μὴ ἀμαθῶς ἐναύιονται [to produce the limping (metra) are not unlearnedly inspired] evokes a complex picture of poetic composition and poetic failure. Callimachus employs the verb τίκτω of poetic composition in the *Aetia* prologue, there also in a context of *recusatio,*[17] as part of his own assertion of what he will not do. In this passage of *Iambus* 13 the phrase τὰ χωλὰ τίκτειν when first read on a purely literal level presents a troubling oxymoron. τὰ χωλά is an unusual object of "giving birth," and the position of the attribute for τὰ μέτρα of the previous line is thus effective in rendering an image of a birth that is undesirable. The critic's language falls back on itself. The image of what a (from the point of view of the critic) true imitator should do is presented as something undesirable.[18] It is not the expected metrical term χωλά[19] that is thus surprising, rather the immediate apposition of images of childbirth and deformity. Callimachus' third hymn (to Artemis) parallels this image in the catalogue of woes attendant on the city of unjust men:

16. *Iambus* 1.97 κἀποπλεῖν ὥρη.

17. See ch. 1, n. 38 above.

Aristophanes demonstrates a similar use of the idiom in the *Frogs,* 1058–62, where Aeschylus denounces Euripides for his use of unelevated language; here too τίκτειν is connected with the very grand, even unwieldy.

> ἀλλ', ὦ κακόδαιμον, ἀνάγκη
> μεγάλων γνωμῶν καὶ διανοιῶν ἴσα καὶ τὰ ῥήματα τίκτειν.
> κἄλλως εἰκὸς τοὺς ἡμιθέους τοῖς ῥήμασι μείζοσι χρῆσθαι·
> καὶ γὰρ τοῖς ἱματίοις ἡμῶν χρῶνται πολὺ σεμνοτέροισιν.
> ἀμοῦ χρηστῶς καταδείξαντος διελυμήνω σύ.
>
> But it is a necessary character, wretch,
> of great thoughts and intentions to produce also equal expressions.
> And in any case it is logical that demigods use greater words,
> for they also use more imposing outfits than ours.
> I demonstrated these things nobly, you've sullied them.

18. See also Hunter (1997) 43 n. 8.

19. Or κύλλα as in Herodas 8.79 τ]ὰ κύλλ' ἀείδειν. Cf. Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.250–51 *nec sermones ego mallem | repentis per humum,* and K. Freudenburg, *The Walking Muse: Horace on the Theory of Satire* (Princeton, 1993), 183–184 on these lines.

cχέτλιοι, οἷc τύνη χαλεπὴν ἐμμάξεαι ὀργήν·
κτήνεά φιν λοιμὸc καταβόcκεται, ἔργα δὲ πάχνη,
κείρονται δὲ γέροντεc ἐφ' υἱάcιν, αἱ δὲ γυναῖκεc
ἢ βληταὶ θνῄcκουcι λεχωίδεc ἠὲ φυγοῦcαι
τίκτουcιν τῶν οὐδὲν ἐπὶ cφυρὸν ὀρθὸν ἀνέcτη.
Callim. *Hy.* 3.124–28

Wretches, upon whom you [Artemis] inflict your grievous anger.
For plague feeds on their herds, and frost on their crops,
and the old men cut their hair in mourning for their sons,
while their wives either die, struck down in childbirth,
or if they evade death, give birth to children of whom none stands
on upright ankle.

The phrase μὴ ἀμαθῶc ἐναύιονται [are not unlearnedly inspired] is a second surprising verbal apposition of poetic images.[20] The verb ἐναύομαι is attested elsewhere with this metaphorical sense of inspiration.[21] Inspiration would appear, however, to be something that does or does not occur, not something that occurs in a qualified sense more or less learnedly. By juxtaposing a qualifier drawn from the language of acquired knowledge with the image of inspiration Callimachus creates a *subridens* portrayal of the critic's conceptualization of poetic composition, an image he reenforces with the double negative in μὴ ἀμαθῶc. The poet plays here on the narrow views of his critic and at the same time deftly interweaves concepts of poetic craft and poetic inspiration that will reappear throughout the poem and that are essential to its programmatic message.

Callimachus' serio-ironic portrayal of the "poet" Polyphemus at *Ep.* 46.1–2 (3 G.-P.) has a similar *subridens* use of ἀμαθής:

Ὡc ἀγαθὰν Πολύφαμοc ἀνεύρατο τὰν ἐπαοιδάν
τὠραμένῳ· ναὶ Γᾶν, οὐκ ἀμαθὴc ὁ Κύκλωψ·

What an effective charm Polyphemus discovered
for one in love. By Ge, our Cyclops was not unlearned.

20. Taking μὴ ἀμαθῶc with ἐναύιονται to express a doubtful assertion (cf. Goodwin *MT* § 269) rather than with τὰ χωλὰ τίκτειν (as Scodel [1987] 210). This seems both the more natural order, (see V. Bartoletti, "Die Allegorie des Feuers in den 'Iamben' des Kallimachos," in *Kallimachos,* ed. A. D. Skiadas [Darmstadt, 1975], 154–55), and especially to be suggested by the meter, where the caesura after the fifth syllable renders the discrete units τὰ χωλὰ τίκτειν and μὴ ἀμαθῶc ἐναύιονται. However, my point on juxtaposition in the phrasing would not be obviated by the second reading, as the phrase μὴ ἀμαθῶc τίκτειν renders a very similar striking apposition of qualifier and verbal image.

21. E.g. Cratinus fr. 450 K.-A. and Nossis 11.1–2 G.-P. ὦ ξεῖν', εἰ τύ γε πλεῖc ποτὶ καλλίχορον Μιτυλήναν | τᾶν Cαπφοῦc χαρίτων ἄνθοc ἐναυcόμενος . . .

In this epigram there is a multileveled play on poetic inspiration and medical knowledge and also on the erotic as at once cause and remedy of the same emotional state. The subtle humor of Polyphemus as οὐκ ἀμαθὴς has too an effect of oxymoron. For the erotic here, as poetic inspiration in *Iambus* 13, is hardly something controlled οὐκ ἀμαθῶς, and the uncivilized Cyclops can only humorously take on the title of learned poet.

The subsequent eight lines of the critic's tirade are in two sections of four lines, an appraisal (negative) of the poet's choliambic verses and an appraisal (also negative) of the poet's mental health. The critic's tirade (lines 11–22), assuming that it begins at about line 10, consists of a three-fold thematic development in its reproach to the poet: (1) what the poet has omitted to do in composing choliambic verse, (2) the defective quality of what the poet has composed, and (3) the defective mental health of the poet, and, apparently, his alienation from the Muses. If we read κ̣α̣λ̣α̣ὶ̣ Μο̣ῦ̣ς̣α̣ι at line 22 the critic concludes by appropriating the poet's words (and inspirational image) from the opening line of the poem, just as Callimachus at the end appropriates the words of his critic for his own self-definition.[22] The poet himself thus becomes the traditional object of invective, and, like Mimnes in Hippon. fr. 28 W. (39 Deg.), is derided for his artistic composition, and by extension for his ethical character. Just as Hipponax derides Mimnes for his low birth (line 5 νικύρτα καὶ σάβαννι [slave of slaves and baseborn scoundrel]), so the critic at lines 54–56 reviles the poet for his dubious origin.[23] Callimachus inverts the roles that characterize choliambic invective verse. The poet himself is the object, as the creator and therefore the representative of bad art. There is, of course, the particularly Alexandrian touch to this inversion that the bad art should be

22. At lines 50 ff. Callimachus again appropriates the Muses and their favor and turns this against his critic; appropriation of inspiration is the underlying theme of the whole poem.

23.

]. δ[ύ]νηται τὴν γενὴν ἀνακρίνει
κα[ὶ] δοῦλον εἶναί φησι καὶ παλίμπρητον
καὶ τοῦ πρ . . . . . ου τὸν βραχίονα στίζει,

]. is able questions my birth
and says that I am a slave and one bought and sold repeatedly
and τοῦ πρ . . . . . ου brands my arm,

Such charges of low-birth are themselves a *topos* of iambic poetry. Elsewhere Callimachus has of course grander connections; the same poet, in a different genre, is descended from the kings of Cyrene (eg. *Ep.* 35 Pf. = 20 G.-P.).

understood as a faulty use and imitation of the literary past, part of the ongoing dialectic of Hellenistic poetry and its heritage.

The critic's disparaging evaluation of the poet's verse (15–18) interweaves the high and the low in inspirational and compositional imagery. Callimachus employs the verb πνέω / πνείω and its related forms elsewhere specifically for poetic composition (e.g. *Ep.* 8.3 Pf. [58 G.-P.]),[24] and also for the erotic, often the erotic associated with song.[25] In the apparent opposition in line 15 of high and low, inspiration and belly (γαcτέρα), we may understand a pejorative reference to this poet's faulty inspiration. Callimachus refers frequently elsewhere, and in settings of varying tone, to his θυμός [heart], but the reference to the poet's γαστήρ is one particularly appropriate to iambic poetry [26] and to an invective context. The juxtaposition of high and low continues at line 17 with weaving (ἐμπ[έ]πλεκται)[27] and babbling nonsense (λαλευc ι[. .]. .[). The verb λαλέω and its related adjective λάλος are terms that Callimachus uses elsewhere in the *Iambi* of the objects of his own invective, Euhemerus in *Iambus* 1.10–11 and the variously voiced poets of *Iambus* 2.14. Here in *Iambus* 13 he has turned the force of invective, and the aesthetic criticism cloaked therein, upon himself. And he has put into his critic's speech the characterizations of incoherent babbling and of confusion of language that he himself employs to revile others. The figure of the critic qua voice of iambic invective thus denounces the poet in terms similar to those which the poet himself as critic denounces.

Finally the critic assails the poet with the charge that he is insane, a characterization that the poetic voice of *Iambus* 1 also puts into the mouth of an unnamed opponent at lines 78–79 ἀλλ' ἢν ὀρῇ τιc, 'οὗτοc | 'Αλκμέων' φήcει | καὶ 'φεῦγε· βάλλει· φεῦγ'' ἐρεῖ 'τὸν ἄνθρωπον.' [but if someone sees, he will say, "This one is Alcmeon," and "flee—he strikes—flee the man" he will say]. Clayman[28] notes also the self-reference to-

24. *Ep.* 8.3 Pf. (58 G.-P.) μὴ πνεύcῃc ἐνδέξιοc.

25. Cf. *Hymn* 2.80–83, *Ep.* 41.1–2 Pf. (4 G.-P.), fr. 110.54–56, *Iambus* 1.29–30, *Ep.* 5.7–9 Pf. (14 G.-P.).

26. Of many instances in archaic iambic a tetrameter fragment of Archilochus (fr. 124.4–5 W.) provides a particularly striking parallel: ἀλλά σεο γαστὴρ νόον τε καὶ φρέναc παρήγαγεν | εἰc ἀναιδείην. [your belly led your mind and wits astray to shamelessness].

The *locus classicus* of γαστήρ as a term of denigration in association with a poet's inspiration is of course the Muses' address to Hesiod at *Theog.* 26 ποιμένες ἄγραυλοι, κάκ' ἐλέγχεα, γαστέρες οἷον. Cf. Svenbro (1976) 50–59. On a similar paradox of tone cf. A. W. Bulloch (1970) 269–76 on *P. Ant.* 113.

27. The traditional image of the poetic craft as weaving (ἐμπ[έ]πλεκται) appears in a similarly negative context in the discussion of poetry in Plato's *Laws* II 669d2–5 ποιηταὶ δὲ ἀνθρώπινοι σφόδρα τὰ τοιαῦτα ἐμπλέκοντεc καὶ cυγκυκῶντεc ἀλόγωc, γέλωτ' ἂν παρακευάζοιεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὅcουc φηcὶν 'Ορφεὺc λαχεῖν ὥραν τῆc τέρψιοc.

28. Clayman (1980) 46.

ward the conclusion of *Iambus* 3 (lines 38–39) νῦν δ' ὁ μάργοc ἐc Μούcαc | ἔνευcα· [but now a horny madman I have inclined to the Muses], which is, however, a somewhat different concept of madness (μάργος is used especially of the sexually incontinent). The "madness" of the poet (and indeed of his satiric successor in Horace) is a madness perceived from the outside, by external observers, rather than a self-reflective judgment as the μάργος of *Iambus* 3. The furor of the poet is an image which recurs in *Iambus* 13 at lines 52–53 . . . ἐc κέραc τεθύμω-ται | κοτέω]ν ἀοιδῷ κἠμὲ δει. . [rage rising in his horns, angry with the singer and me . . .].

It is not possible to reconstruct the last line of the critic's address. Lobel's suggested reading for line 22 κ̣α̣λ̣α̣ι̣ μου̣c̣α̣ι, is very attractive, as the critic would then conclude his reproach with the poet's opening words (line 1), as the poet (64–66) concludes his response by citing the words of his critic. The poet returns to the Muses at line 26, and apparently at 50 ff. and 57–59; the appropriation of the Muses, and of inspiration, is again a central theme of the poem. The sense here at the end of the critic's tirade appears to be, drawing on the tone of the poet's response, that the Muses are alienated by the nature of the poet's verses, and by his conduct, as these verses emblematize his conduct. The poet of the *Iambi,* in the eyes of his critic, is at once apart from his Hipponactean model, his correct figure of genre in image and language, and is apart from his source of divine inspiration.

The Poet Responds

With ὦ λῷcτ' (line 24) the poet opens his response to his critic, marking him out as an individual figure, as does the second person singular of λεcχαίνειc at line 40, and, accepting Ardizzoni's reading c̣κέψαι at 33, this imperative as well. As in *Iambus* 1, where the poet singles out one of a crowd of dissenting literati with the phrase ὦ λῷcτε (*Iambus* 1.33), so here he designates one adversary with the same vivid, immediate effect.[29] Whether we are meant to identify the critic of *Iambus* 13 as one of the literati of *Iambus* 1[30] is probably a moot question; the figure of the critic is rather a rhetorical tool. There are many thematic and verbal parallels shared by the two poems, but *Iambus* 13 lacks the fictional

29. On the conventionalized occasional features of both poems see M. Depew, "Mimesis and Aetiology in Callimachus' Hymns," in *Callimachus,* ed. M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit, and G. C. Wakker (Groningen 1993) 63–64.

30. Cf. Depew (1993) 64.

frame and dramatic setting of *Iambus* 1.[31] Rather, in both poems the critics are a rhetorical structure to whom the poet can respond. This is a somewhat different artistic conceit from a direct address to a known, even named, individual who is an example of a behavioral type that the poet decries (e.g. the school teacher of *Iambus* 5), and also different from apostrophizing a god or image of a god (e.g. *Iambus* 9). In the former case the direct address to a specified individual allows the poet a medium for invective expression. Here the addressee, the recipient of this invective, does not reply. The latter type of address[32] often has a didactic purpose in Callimachus' poetry. The addressee, whether as personification or pathetic fallacy, does respond, and the didactic nature of the poem evolves in a mode of question and answer. The critic in *Iambus* 13 is characteristic rather than specific, and his tirade is a rhetorical strategem. Callimachus highlights the interactive nature of the paired speeches by repeating his critic's words of censure at the end of his response, turning those words to self-defense and self-definition.

Further, Callimachus characterizes his response in similar imagery. At the beginning of the poet's apologia, the marked Hipponactean references to physical violence (κόψαc) and low retail (ἀπεμπολῇ) stand out as emblematic of the larger, Callimachean version of the choliamb—as a medium for literary criticism. While the poet admits that he has not journeyed to Ephesus nor mingled with the Ionians, he at the same time composes his poem of self-defense in the Hipponactean choliamb, replete with Hipponactean language and imagery. This is in and of itself the contradiction of his critic.

Poet and Genre

The lines of *Iambus* 13 most frequently cited are the four lines (30–33) of the poet's response that, in the form of rhetorical question and answer, outline Callimachus' conceptualization of poetic genres, his own place in an inherited tradition, and earlier perceptions of the poetic calling.

31. Scodel (1987) 200–201 draws a suggestive parallel from the two groups of critics in Horace *Sat.* 1.4 and 1.10.

32. This is also a rhetorical strategem of Hipponax as in fr. 32.1–2 W. (42 Deg.) cited above p. 71 or e.g. fr. 38 W. (47 Deg.):

> ὦ Ζεῦ, πάτερ ⟨Ζεῦ⟩, θεῶν ὍΟλυμπίων πάλμυ,
> τί μοὐκ ἔδωκας χρυσόν, ἀργύρου †πάλμυ;
>
> Zeus, father Zeus, lord of the Olympian gods
> Why didn't you give me gold, of silver †πάλμυ

30 τίc εἶπεν αυτ̣[. . . .]λε. . ρ. [. . . .] .
cὺ πεντάμετρα cυντίθει, cὺ δ̣’ ἠ[ρῷο]ν,
cὺ δὲ τραγῳδε[ῖν] ἐκ θεῶν ἐκληρώcω̣ ;
δοκέω μὲν οὐδείc, ἀλλὰ καὶ το. δ. . κεψαι

30 who said αυτ̣[. . . .]λε. . ρ. [. . . .] .
you compose pentameters, you the [heroic],
it is your lot from the gods to compose tragedy?
In my opinion no one, but [consider] also [this]

These lines and the subsequent lines in the poem (41–45) that reflect them are at the center of ongoing debate concerning *Iambus* 13 and the *Iambi* as a collection. The problems these lines occasion are two, although in some senses they are interconnected. They are (1) the relevance of these lines themselves qua paradigm to the *Iambi* as a self-contained collection, and (2) whether and in what manner these lines recollect Socrates' discussion of divine inspiration in Plato's *Ion* 534c. I hope in what follows to suggest a new angle for considering each of these problems.

1. R. Scodel[33] in commenting on these lines as emblematic of the *Iambi* as a collection has succinctly phrased the problem:

> The poem appears to have continued with the theme [sc. Callimachus' writing in a variety of poetic genres] for some time. According to the *Diegesis* (9. 35–38), Callimachus adduced the example of Ion of Chios as a poet who was successful in many genres (43–47), and compared poets to carpenters, who are not blamed for making different kinds of goods. It is not clear whether πολυείδεια refers to the collection of *Iambi* alone, whose poems encompass a wide range of tones, subjects, and meters, or the Callimachean corpus as a whole; the first alternative fits better with the preceding theme of dialect mixture, where choliambics are explicitly mentioned; the issue is not just how to write verse but how to write in this genre. But the denial that there is a "one poet, one genre" rule and the example of Ion of Chios fit the second better, for Ion is praised for his work in different genres, not for expanding the boundaries of these forms. The latter interpretation is therefore likelier.

The relationship of the *Iambi,* as individual poems and as a collection, to other works of Callimachus is a complex one, as the many verbal and thematic parallels attest. The *Iambi* also exhibit, for example in the rhetorical stratagem of a fictional critic, a multiplicity of intended audience; the poet intends his self-defense in *Iambus* 13 for both the critic within the poem and for a larger audience. Callimachus could thus answer the direct criticism his opponent offers here, clearly crit-

33. Scodel (1987) 208.

icism of the *Iambi* and their composition, with a defense he draws from his entire poetic oeuvre. In this way he would answer criticism of *polyeideia* in one collection of poems with a defense of *polyeideia* drawn from all his work; Ion of Chios is then a sort of transparent paradigm of variety in a larger context (composition in many genres) as an exemplar for variety in a smaller one (this collection of iambic poems).

Yet it would seem that the paradigm, Ion of Chios, must have closer relevance to the *Iambi,* and specifically to *Iambus* 13. The structure of the poem as a dialogue between critic and poet is carefully preserved here (24 ὦ λῷcτ', the singular aorist masculine participle κόψαc at 27, 40 λεcχαίνειc, perhaps 38 cύ; the references to the opponent at 55 φηcι and 56 cτίζει are also to one speaker). The poet creates an ideal setting in this way for responding in his self-defense to his critic's individual points. Indeed the dialogue may evoke a more formalized duellistic setting. Pfeiffer suggests in his commentary to these lines that the ἐρῆμοc of 24 can be understood in the judicial sense of an ἐρῆμος δίκη, a suit which is won by default through the absence of one of the litigating parties, a suggestion that aptly fits both the characteristic of self-defense of the poet's response as well as the prominent role of the agon elsewhere in the collection (as that of *Iambus* 4). The opening lines of the poet's response show a marked use of iambic tone and imagery, with specific recollections of *Iambus* 1 and of the poet's initial appearance as choliambic voice in that poem. The final lines of *Iambus* 13 (64–66), the critic's disparaging points at 11–14 now repeated but with a new significance coming from the poet himself, draw us back specifically to choliambic and its composition (as does much of the imagery in 52 ff.). The central focus of the poet's critic, Callimachus' composition of choliambic verse, is not abandoned in the course of the poem for another theme—the introduction of Ion of Chios as paradigm must, it would seem, be directly relevant to the composition of choliambic verse by Callimachus.

One interpretation of these lines and of their application to the *Iambi* may resolve the apparent paradox some have perceived here. This would recognize the signal emphasis in *Iambus* 13 on the poet's composition specifically of choliambic verse as the novel and, at least in the eyes of the critic, questionable undertaking. The critic disparages the poet, not for attempting to compose verse of any kind whatsoever, but specifically for attempting to compose choliambic—for venturing into the composition of a novel or unfamiliar genre from something else.[34]

34. Dawson (1950) 131–32 follows in part a similar line of argument. "The wording of the διήγησις, whether we read ἀπάντων or ἀπαντῶν, suggests that Callimachus' literary

The argument that one poet is allotted only one genre, and the paradigm of Ion of Chios as a poet who composed in a multiplicity of genres, still can be understood by analogy to apply to a larger corpus. Both are, however, immediately relevant to Callimachus' composition of choliambic verse as a venture into a novel artistic terrain. The final, very declarative, line of the epilogue to the *Aetia* (fr. 112 Pf.) αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ Μουcέων πεζὸν [ἔ]πειμι νομόν is especially relevant here. The poet self-consciously underlines his progression from one genre into another, marking iambic as the novel landscape.

2. It has long been suggested that in lines 30–33 of *Iambus* 13 Callimachus is responding to Socrates' statement on the delimiting nature of divine inspiration in Plato's *Ion*. Socrates here tries to convince a rhapsode named Ion of Ephesus[35] that Ion excels in reciting the Homeric epics but not in working in other poetic genres because he (Ion) owes his artistic ability as a rhapsode to divine inspiration, not to skill:

> ἅτε οὖν οὐ τέχνῃ ποιοῦντες καὶ πολλὰ λέγοντες καὶ καλὰ περὶ τῶν πραγμάτων, ὥσπερ σὺ περὶ Ὁμήρου, ἀλλὰ θείᾳ μοίρᾳ, τοῦτο μόνον οἷός τε ἕκαστος ποιεῖν καλῶς ἐφ' ὃ ἡ Μοῦσα αὐτὸν ὥρμησεν, ὁ μὲν διθυράμβους, ὁ δὲ ἐγκώμια, ὁ δὲ ὑπορχήματα, ὁ δ' ἔπη, ὁ δ' ἰάμβους· τὰ δ' ἄλλα φαῦλος αὐτῶν ἕκαστός ἐστιν. οὐ γὰρ τέχνῃ ταῦτα λέγουσιν ἀλλὰ θείᾳ δυνάμει, ἐπεί, εἰ περὶ ἑνὸς τέχνῃ καλῶς ἠπίσταντο λέγειν, κἂν περὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἁπάντων·
>
> Plato, *Ion* 534b7–c7

> Therefore, inasmuch as it is not by skill that they create and say many beautiful things about events, as you do about Homer, but by divine allotment, each one is able to create this thing alone toward which the Muse incites him, this one dithyrambs, and this one encomia, this one hyporchemata, this one epics, and this one iambics. And each of these is inept in regard to the rest. For not by skill do they say these things but by a divine power, since, if they knew how to speak well about each type by skill, they would also know how to do so about all the others.

In this serio-ironic discourse on poetic theory, each poet is limited to one genre. If Callimachus is appropriating Plato's definition here, there is clearly an element of the paradoxical in the appropriation.

---

activity had been marked by considerable variety of form before the writing of *Iambus* XIII. Diverse as the several *Iambi* are, the term πολυείδεια is hardly applicable to them alone. But Callimachus clearly included specific reference to his *Iambi;* his opponents—whether they included Herondas, as Knox suggests—apparently attacked his claim to be the modern representative of the Ionian verse of Hipponax."

35. Pl. *Ion* 533b5-c2: Ἀλλὰ μήν, ὥς γ' ἐγὼ οἶμαι, οὐδ' ἐν αὐλήσει γε οὐδὲ ἐν κιθαρίσει οὐδὲ ἐν κιθαρῳδίᾳ οὐδὲ ἐν ῥαψῳδίᾳ οὐδεπώποτ' εἶδες ἄνδρα ὅστις περὶ μὲν Ὀλύμπου δεινός ἐστιν ἐξηγεῖσθαι ἢ περὶ Θαμύρου ἢ περὶ Ὀρφέως ἢ περὶ Φημίου τοῦ Ἰθακησίου ῥαψῳδοῦ, περὶ δὲ Ἴωνος τοῦ Ἐφεσίου [ῥαψῳδοῦ] ἀπορεῖ καὶ οὐκ ἔχει συμβαλλέσθαι ἅ τε εὖ ῥαψῳδεῖ καὶ ἃ μή.

There are, of course, striking similarities between the two passages; individual and poetic genre, cataloging of genres, and the overall rhetorical structure of each. There are also differences. Callimachus inverts Platonic theory elsewhere in his work,[36] and it is very likely that he is again doing so here.

The association of the rhapsode of Plato's dialogue with the poet Ion of Chios is an erroneous reference made already in the testimonia to the poet Ion,[37] and one of which Callimachus himself may well have been aware.[38] It would, however, appear unlikely that Plato intends the association of the two figures. The poet Ion of Chios, composer of works in a wide variety of genres throughout much of the fifth century, is already dead in the 420s. More importantly, Plato's dialogue assumes a competence of the individual artist in one genre alone. Even leaving aside the question of whether the dialogue is meant to be descriptive of an existing status quo of artist and genre,[39] it would seem unlikely

36. As he does with Platonic homoerotic paideutic imagery in both *Iambi* 3 and 5. Another Callimachean rewriting of Plato is *Ep.* 23 Pf. (53 G.-P.):

> Εἴπαc '"Ηλιε χαῖρε' Κλεόμβροτοc ὠμβρακιώτηc
> ἅλατ' ἀφ' ὑψηλοῦ τείχεοc εἰc 'Αΐδην,
> ἄξιον οὐδὲν ἰδὼν θανάτου κακόν, ἀλλὰ Πλάτωνοc
> ἓν τὸ περὶ ψυχῆc γράμμ' ἀναλεξάμενοc.
>
> Saying "Farewell, Sun," the Ambracian Cleombrotus
> leapt from a lofty wall to Hades.
> Not because he saw any evil worth death, but of Plato
> He read one writing—the one on the soul.

To what extent Callimachus, especially in the *Iambi,* may be influenced by contemporary philosophical movements, by Cynicism in particular, is a vexed question. On Callimachus' opinion of Plato as a critic cf. fr. 460 Pf. (πρὸc Πραξιφάνην) with Pfeiffer's comments, fr. 589 Pf. (incertae sedis).

37. Cf. Schol. RVLh(Ald) Ar. *Peace* 835–37a 11–12 (del. Jacoby): Σωκράτους δὲ τοῦ φιλοσόφου ἐστὶν εἰς αὐτὸν λόγος λεγόμενος "Ιων; A. v. Blumenthal, ed., *Ion von Chios: die Reste seiner Werke* (Stuttgart, 1939), 10. This error is not, however, prevalent throughout antiquity; cf. Luc. 34.6.4–7 (*Philopseudeis*): [. . .] καὶ "Ιων, οἶσθα τὸν ἐπὶ τοῖς Πλάτωνος λόγοις θαυμάζεσθαι ἀξιοῦντα ὡς μόνον ἀκριβῶς κατανενοηκότα τὴν γνώμην τοῦ ἀνδρὸς καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ὑποφητεῦσαι δυνάμενον.

38. See Hunter (1997) 46–47.

39. Ion of Chios presents a similar paradox vis-à-vis the conclusion of Plato's *Symposium* as well. There Socrates, Agathon, and Aristophanes are portrayed as debating whether it can be the same man's calling to compose comedy and tragedy (223c6–d6): καὶ τὰ μὲν ἄλλα ὁ 'Αριστόδημος οὐκ ἔφη μεμνῆσθαι τῶν λόγων - [. . .] - τὸ μέντοι κεφάλαιον, ἔφη, προσαναγκάζειν τὸν Σωκράτη ὁμολογεῖν αὐτοὺς τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀνδρὸς εἶναι κωμῳδίαν καὶ τραγῳδίαν ἐπίστασθαι ποιεῖν, καὶ τὸν τέχνῃ τραγῳδοποιὸν ὄντα ⟨καὶ⟩ κωμῳδοποιὸν εἶναι. This passage has itself served as proof that the tragic poet Ion could not have composed comedy, as the testimonia maintain. A wiser approach here also might be to distinguish theoretical discussion of artistic composition from a less demarcated reality.

Besides Ion, Pindar and Simonides, among others, are known to have composed in

that Plato would want to evoke the image of a successful composer of a multitude of artistic types in a dialogue that argues for the limitations of the artistic genius.

If Callimachus does mean to evoke Plato's *Ion* here, we must ask ourselves why. For what purpose would Callimachus introduce in this poem, which develops as his own assertion of the artist's capability of composing in a variety of poetic genres, the image of an overconfident rhapsode proven not only to be limited to one poetic genre, but to engage in an art form, rhapsody, which is clearly marked out as derivative?[40] M. Depew may be right in suggesting that Callimachus evokes the passage from the *Ion* in order to respond to the challenge posed by Socrates:[41] the poet of *Iambus* 13 *does* possess skill, and *is* able to compose in more than one genre. I believe we can carry this one step further; Callimachus evokes the passage from the *Ion* and the homonymous figure to introduce his paradigm, Ion of Chios, successful composer of a variety of poetic types. Ion of Chios is thus also a refutation of Socrates' definition, a refutation further with the very name of Socrates' addressee. A part of this conceit is the dissimilarity of the generic categories involved in the two passages. Socrates suggests to the rhapsode in the *Ion* that each poet is inspired in one poetic kind: ὁ μὲν διθυράμβους, ὁ δὲ ἐγκώμια, ὁ δὲ ὑπορχήματα, ὁ δ' ἔπη, ὁ δ' ἰάμβους [this one dithyrambs, and this one encomia, this one hyporchemata, this one epics, and this one iambics]. The poet of *Iambus* 13 phrases his question with a different set of categories: cὺ πεντάμετρα cυντίθει, cὺ δ' ἡ[ρῷο]ν,|cὺ δὲ τραγῳδε[ῖν] ἐκ θεῶν ἐκληρώcω; [you compose pentameters, you the [heroic], it is your lot from the gods to compose tragedy?] This categorization, which is in

several genres. There is an anachronistic quality about the argument of the *Ion* that suggests that Socrates' statements are not a *de facto* assessment of Greek poetry as such.

It is occasionally suggested that the sense of *Ion* 534b7–c7 can be more comprehensibly rendered by laying great weight on the delimiting adverb καλῶς. So although a poet might compose in several genres, he is only great in one. This reading would, however, imply a blanket judgment of earlier and contemporary poetry that we should hesitate to ascribe to this text; further the dialogue appears to understand poetic inspiration as an either/or phenomenon, not one that possesses the singer to a greater or less degree.

40.

ΣΩ. Οὐκοῦν ὑμεῖς αὖ οἱ ῥαψῳδοὶ τὰ τῶν ποιητῶν ἑρμηνεύετε·
ΙΩΝ. Καὶ τοῦτο ἀληθὲς λέγεις.
ΣΩ. Οὐκοῦν ἑρμηνέων ἑρμηνῆς γίγνεσθε;
ΙΩΝ. Παντάπασί γε.

Plato *Ion* 535a6-10

41. Depew (1992) 326–27.

part reiterated in lines 44–45, is not a random one. I suggest that while the rhetorical question may look to Plato's *Ion,* the specific categories of lines 30–33 allude to the poet Ion of Chios. The poet anticipates his paradigm in the phrasing of his rhetorical question, and (if we follow Knox and Ardizzoni) the command ἀλλὰ καὶ τόδε ϲκέψαι underscores this intent.

Ion of Chios composed both tragedy and elegy; substantial fragments of both survive. Callimachus recalls these here in *Iambus* 13 within the context of the paradigm itself: τραγῳδούϲ at line 44 and π]εντάμετρον at line 45. The category ἡ[ρῷο]ν is less immediately obvious. If the conjectured reading here is correct, the desired genre is hexameter verse. Of Ion's attested works either the hymns (e.g. the hymn to Καιρός fr. 87 = *PMG* 742), the encomia (e.g. fr. 88 = *PMG* 743) or perhaps the Κοσμολογικός are probable candidates as hexameter poetry. Both the paucity of Ion's extant fragments and the cryptic nature of the testimonia[42] impede a certain identification. The term ἡρῷος [heroic] is, further, usually a term descriptive of ῥυθμός [rhythm] rather than of poetic genre[43] per se; such a characterization might cover, for example, encomia among other genres attributed to Ion.

The poet frames his paradigm, Ion of Chios, with lines that are doubly self-referential. For both the freedom to compose in a variety of poetic genres and the enduring inspiration of the Muses for the poet are ascribable at once both to the poetic "I" of *Iambus* 13 and to the paradigmatic figure he introduces to validate his own stance as poetic voice. Callimachus structures the introduction of his paradigm in the same way as he does the parable of *Iambus* 1. The permeable nature of the frame allows the positive characterization of the exemplar to reflect back on the speaker of the poem. This effect is especially heightened

42. The testimonia suggest that Ion also wrote works in prose: Schol. RVLh (Ald) Ar. *Peace* 835–837a lines 6–7: καὶ καταλογάδην τὸν Πρεσβευτικὸν λεγόμενον, ὃν νόθον ἀξιοῦσιν εἶναί τινες καὶ οὐχὶ αὐτοῦ (this last Jacoby thought to refer to the Κοσμολογικός, *FGrH* 392 F 24–26, n. 110); Plut. *Fort. Rom.* 1.316d: Ἴων μὲν οὖν ὁ ποιητὴς ἐν τοῖς δίχα μέτρου καὶ καταλογάδην αὐτῷ γεγραμμένοις φησίν . . . .

43. Cf. e.g. Plato *Rep.* 400b4-c1: οἶμαι δέ με ἀκηκοέναι οὐ σαφῶς ἐνόπλιόν τέ τινα ὀνομάζοντος αὐτοῦ σύνθετον καὶ δάκτυλον καὶ ἡρῷόν γε, οὐκ οἶδα ὅπως διακοσμοῦντος καὶ ἴσον ἄνω καὶ κάτω τιθέντος, εἰς βραχύ τε καὶ μακρὸν γιγνόμενον, καί, ὡς ἐγὼ οἶμαι, ἴαμβον καί τιν' ἄλλον τροχαῖον ὠνόμαζε, μήκη δὲ καὶ βραχύτητας προσῆπτε. Arist. *Rhet.* 1408b32-1409a1: τῶν δὲ ῥυθμῶν ὁ μὲν ἡρῷος σεμνῆς ἀλλ' [οὐ] λεκτικῆς ἁρμονίας δεόμενος, ὁ δ' ἴαμβος αὐτή ἐστιν ἡ λέξις ἡ τῶν πολλῶν (διὸ μάλιστα πάντων τῶν μέτρων ἰαμβεῖα φθέγγονται λέγοντες), δεῖ δὲ σεμνότητα γενέσθαι καὶ ἐκστῆσαι. ὁ δὲ τροχαῖος κορδακικώτερος· δηλοῖ δὲ τὰ τετράμετρα· ἔστι γὰρ τροχερὸς ῥυθμὸς τὰ τετράμετρα. p.s.-Demetrius *De elocutio.* 5 σχεδὸν γὰρ τῷ μεγέθει τοῦ κώλου συνεξῆρται καὶ ὁ λόγος. διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ⟨τὸ⟩ ἑξάμετρον ἡρῷόν τε ὀνομάζεται ὑπὸ τοῦ μήκους . Cf. also W. Rhys Roberts' notes p. 284.

by the language and imagery of song assigned to the speaker and to the paradigmatic figure. The presentation of Ion, an incontestably valid poetic voice, valorizes the stance of the singer of our poem.

Both Ion of Chios and Callimachus are successful poets in many genres, and thus refutations of Socrates' statement in the *Ion*. The seeming parallelism of the two passages turns out to be an opposed one. Plato's *Ion* need not be the sole model for the rhetorical question posed by these lines of *Iambus* 13. The topic of delimitation of genre is one that clearly caught the attention of poets of the fourth century, and it would be expected that a stock of language and imagery would exist for this, as for other features of poetic composition, from which different authors might draw. Nonetheless, the passage is surely in part a Callimachean rewriting of Plato, a rewriting we find elsewhere. The same passage of the *Ion* provides an analogous example, as M. Depew has observed.[44] Both Socrates in the *Ion*[45] and Apollo at the programmatic conclusion to Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo*[46] characterize poetic composition in terms of the metaphor of bees, one of the standards in the repertory of Greek poetics. The sense in which the two authors employ the metaphor, however, is counterpoised. Socrates uses the metaphor to demonstrate the unstable nature of the poetic genius. Callimachus uses it to draw on a traditional imagery of the sacred and the refined.[47] The metaphor remains the same, but the manner in which it is used in the two passages shows a marked contradistinction, a rewriting of poetic inspiration in one author by another.

Iambi 1 and 13

Iambi 1 and 13 are in several respects parallel poems. Both are definitive assertions of Callimachus' relationship to Hipponax. Both have a central image in the journey as reality and metaphor. Both have an agonistic structure of censure and refutation. Both play with generic boundary. And in each of these categories *Iambus* 13 is a variant image of *Iambus* 1. The correspondences between the two poems turn out to be quite intricate. Whether or not we accept the thirteenth as the last

44. Depew (1992) 327.

45. Pl. *Ion* 534a7-b6: λέγουσι γὰρ δήπουθεν πρὸς ἡμᾶς οἱ ποιηταὶ ὅτι ἀπὸ κρηνῶν μελιρρύτων ἐκ Μουσῶν κήπων τινῶν καὶ ναπῶν δρεπόμενοι τὰ μέλη ἡμῖν φέρουσιν ὥσπερ αἱ μέλιτται, καὶ αὐτοὶ οὕτω πετόμενοι· καὶ ἀληθῆ λέγουσι. κοῦφον γὰρ χρῆμα ποιητής ἐστιν καὶ πτηνὸν καὶ ἱερόν, καὶ οὐ πρότερον οἷός τε ποιεῖν πρὶν ἂν ἔνθεός τε γένηται καὶ ἔκφρων καὶ ὁ νοῦς μηκέτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐνῇ.

46. See ch. 1, n. 56, above.

47. On this passage cf. Pfeiffer (1968) 284.

of the *Iambi,*[48] these two poems are clearly a pair. There are a number of verbal parallels, particularly in the utterances of the two narrative voices. In the following comparative table the one conjectured reading marked with an asterisk is my own.

Iambus 1 (fr. 191 Pf.)		*Iambus* 13 (fr. 203 Pf.)	
line 11	λαλάζων	line 17	λαλευc[. .]. . [
line 31	γριάφεcθε τὴν ῥῆcιν	lines 24–25	ἡ ῥῆcιc ἀκου[cτέα]*
line 33	ὦ λῷcτε	line 24	ὦ λῷcτ’
line 89	κονδύλῳ κ̣απηλεῦ̣c̣[αι	line 27	ἀ̣πεμπολῇ κόψαc
lines 91–92	[πέ]πλον τὰc [Mo]ύ̣cαc	lines 25–26	πέπλ[ον τὰc Μούcαc

The reflection of the one poem in the other is in part the result of recollection, in part of variation. In *Iambus* 1 Callimachus speaks through the mask of the fictive persona of Hipponax; the speaker's censure is cast, with almost theatrical staging, as a public act. As a didactic paradigm he offers a fable of archaic origin, one apparently narrated by Hipponax. In *Iambus* 13 Callimachus speaks in his own voice, and refers to his own *Iambi* as a self-contained poetic collection. He offers as paradigm Ion of Chios, known as a composer of multiple literary genres. *Iambus* 1 confirms Callimachus as a Hipponactean voice. *Iambus* 13 is the poet's affirmation of his different, distanced iambic voice; at the same time he resorts to a model from the earlier tradition, Ion. Both poems are composed in distinctly different ways against the background of the poetic past, and use this past to different ends.[49] Both poems are characterized by variation, differentiation from the themes and spirit of Hipponax; in *Iambus* 1 this variation develops gradually and through a series of surprises, in *Iambus* 13 it is at once an emphatic statement of poetic intent and illustration of this poetic stance.

48. I discuss the problem of frr. 226–29 and the final number of the *Iambi* in the introduction pp. 9–13.

49. The particular awareness of earlier literature shown throughout Hellenistic poetry has long been a central concern of scholarship on this period. Recent assessments include Bing (1988) 50–59, and Goldhill (1991) 223–83. Goldhill has succinctly phrased this awareness (224). "The archive as context for poetic production is also seen in the constant, even obsessional, awareness of past texts. The poet, as Posidippus puts it, has a soul ἐν βύβλοις πεπονημένη, 'worked out in books'. This is seen not only in the fascination with details of earlier writing but also in a search for novelty in narrative and technique through an active response to and manipulation of the texts of the past. The past is in all senses *written through.*"

A further feature the two poems share is the opening address to a plural audience. Callimachus demonstrates a marked variation from the tradition of archaic iambic in addressing a group as the "object" of the *iambos*.[50] In both poems one individual (in *Iambus* 13 the delineated critic), or several individuals singly (in *Iambus* 1 the different figures drawn from the crowd of literati) come later into focus as the object of invective.

Of the *Iambi* only 1 and 13 have opening lines addressed to a plural audience. *Iambi* 3–7, 9, and 12 all begin with opening lines addressed to a single individual; it becomes apparent later in *Iambus* 2 (line 15 ὠνδρόνικε) that there is also a single named addressee of this poem. *Iambi* 8 and 10 are unclear in this respect; *Iambus* 9 may be addressed to a more generic plural audience in the manner of funeral epigrams. Of all three of these poems only a few lines are extant. The plural audiences of *Iambi* 1 and 13 do, however, constitute a further shared feature of the two poems, a feature which indicates quite clearly, I would argue, that the two are meant to be appreciated as a pair.

Ion of Chios

In the text of *Iambus* 13 as we have it Ion of Chios is not named; we owe the knowledge of his place in the poem to the Diegesis (35–38).

> [. . .] φηcιν ὅτι
> Ἴωνα μιμεῖται τὸν τραγικόν·
> ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τὸν τέκτονά τιc μέμφεται πολυειδῆ
> cκεύη τεκταινόμενον.
>
> [. . .] he says
> that he is imitating Ion the tragic poet.
> Nor does anyone find fault with a builder
> for creating a variety of artifacts.

This knowledge sheds light on several images in lines 41–49, as well as enabling us to better appreciate Callimachus' purpose in his choice of paradigm.

Ion of Chios (c. 490–421 B.C.E.),[51] named ὁ τραγικός by the die-

50. An exception is Solon, whose iambic poetry is often framed as response to his opponents.

51. Ion probably died between 428 and 421. Aristophanes' *Peace* (421) details Ion's apotheosis as a star (832–37). He competed in the *Dionysia* which saw the production of Euripides' second *Hippolytus* (428), according to the hypothesis to that play (line 27 Diggle).

gete,[52] is a poet whose career spans much of the fifth century. The testimonia to his life[53] cite his acquaintance with Cimon, Aeschylus, and Sophocles.[54] Like Callimachus he comes upon a cosmopolitan setting (Athens) where he can give full rein to his artistic talent, a setting where he is nonetheless an expatriate. His *Epidēmiai* and *Chiou Ktisis* attest the importance of his native Chios, an importance which has a parallel in the role of Cyrene and the Battiad line in the poetry of Callimachus. The two poets share in this case the experience of displacement, and in both cases the immediate cosmopolitan audience evoked attests the poet's literal distance from his native place.[55] As the thirteenth *Iambus* itself concludes with an evocation of displacement, of temporal and spatial distance from sixth-century Ephesus and the original setting of Hipponactean verse, this shared experience becomes all the more striking.

The testimonia to Ion's life and works and the extant fragments themselves attest to a truly remarkable variety of literary types in both poetry and prose. This is already a precursor to the multifaceted literary interests of Callimachus; it is not surprising that Ion would appeal to Callimachus as a model of artistic variety. Ion's *Epidēmiai* have received particular attention for their historical value[56] and for the novelty of the genre. Several of Ion's attested literary works, particularly the *Chiou Ktisis,* the hymn to Kairos, and the *Epidēmiai,* demonstrate an affinity for literary genres (e.g. foundation poetry) that we associate especially with Hellenistic poetry.

We have evidence for Callimachus' interest in Ion outside of the *Iambi.* Commenting on Ion's philosophical work, the Τριαγμός, the second-century C.E. grammarian Harpocration notes that its author-

52. Elsewhere he is frequently called τραγῳδίας ποιητής. The scholia to Aristophanes' *Peace,* one of the fuller of the testimonia, names Ion διθυράμβων ποιητὴς καὶ τραγωιδίας καὶ μελῶν. The treatment of Ion in the testimonia shows an awareness of the variety of his work, yet a need for classification leads to his identification particularly as a tragedian. This is a good example of the problems that typify categorization and genre; Callimachus in his choice of Ion as example may be indicating an awareness not only of the limitations of categorization but of the specific problems concerned with the poet Ion.

53. All citations are from Leurini's 1992 edition, *Ionis Chii Testimonia et Fragmenta,* which has the advantage of treating the relevant Callimachus fragments, including the Diegesis to *Iambus* 13, which von Blumenthal's 1939 edition does not. Where relevant, cross-references to other standard works that include fragments of Ion of Chios (e.g. *TrGF, PMG,* West *I. et E. Gr.*) are in parentheses.

54. Plut. *Cim.* 9.1 p. 484a, Plut. *Prof. in virt.* 8 p. 79e, Athen. 13, 603e K.

55. See also Hunter (1997) 45–46.

56. F. Jacoby, "Some Remarks on Ion of Chios," *CQ* 41 (1947): 1–17, G. Huxley, "Ion of Chios," *GRBS* 6 (1965): 29–46.

ship was said by Callimachus to have been contested,[57] a reference ascribed to the *Pinakes* (fr. 449 Pf.). Indeed, it seems fairly certain that all the testimonia to Ion of Chios trace their origin back to Callimachus' *Pinakes,* and that it would be in this context that Callimachus would be cognizant of the variety of literary genres in which Ion composed.

The closing lines of the Diegesis suggest a further aspect of Ion's place in *Iambus* 13. Generally the diegete appears to remain close to the text of the poems, and in several instances appears to include direct quotations in addition to the lemmata.[58] It does not seem that the diegete, unlike the Florentine scholiast, introduces material that is external to the poems. We may assume with some certainty that the diegete is drawing the parallel of carpenter and artifacts from lines of *Iambus* 13 now lost. This parallel has three particularly salient features. (1) The parallel of the carpenter is appropriate in tone to the general cast of paradigms in the *Iambi*. Tales of the Seven Sages, animal fables, and talking ithyphallic statues of Hermes all belong in a large sense to what may be termed folk wisdom and folk humor, two of the generic components of traditional iambic and of its Hellenistic descendants. Further, if Callimachus does mean to recall, and to rewrite, Socrates' address to Ion, the use of a particularly Socratic example would be effective. (2) At the same time the metaphor of the poet as craftsman is one of the traditional *topoi* of poetic composition.[59] The association of this metaphor with either Ion of Chios, or the poetic "I" of *Iambus* 13, or both, further adds to the presentation of the "true" poet along with the language and imagery of song, which are associated in the poem with these two figures, but, importantly, not with the critic. (3) Finally, the recognition of this metaphor casts a further light on the sense of 48–49:

]·ἦν γὰρ ἐντελέϲ τε τὸ χρῆμα
. .]. .[.]ι ραγε̣ι̣νο̣ν καὶ λ̣ . . . . ἀνεπλάϲθη

57. Callim. fr. 449 Pf. = Harpocrat. s.v. Ἴων (*Vorsokr.* 36 A I, I[5] p. 377, 15 D.-Kr.) Ἰϲοκράτηϲ ἐν τῷ Περὶ τῆϲ ἀντιδόϲεωϲ (xv 268). Ἴωνοϲ τοῦ τῆϲ τραγῳδίαϲ ποιητοῦ μνημονεύοι ἂν νῦν ὁ ῥήτωρ, ὃϲ ἦν Χῖοϲ μὲν γένοϲ, υἱὸϲ δ' Ὀρθομένουϲ, ἐπίκληϲιν δὲ Ξούθου· ἔγραψε δὲ καὶ μέλη πολλὰ καὶ τραγῳδίαϲ καὶ φιλόϲοφόν τι ϲύγγραμμα τὸν Τριαγμὸν ἐπιγραφόμενον, ὅπερ Καλλίμαχοϲ ἀντιλέγεϲθαί φηϲιν †ὡϲ Ἐπιγένουϲ†. ἐν ἐνίοιϲ δὲ καὶ πληθυντικῶϲ ἐπιγράφεται Τριαγμοί, καθὰ Δημήτριοϲ ὁ Ϲκέψιοϲ καὶ Ἀπολλωνίδηϲ ὁ Νικαεύϲ. ἀναγράφουϲι δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ τάδε· 'ἀρχὴ δέ μοι τοῦ λόγου· πάντα τρία—τύχη.' (*Vors.* 36 B 1). On the identity of this Epigenes see Pfeiffer in his notes.

58. E.g. Dieg. VI 19–20 to *Iambus* 1, which albeit in a damaged state include both τοιγαρ[οῦν | ἔφη suggesting a direct or indirect quotation, and particularly the second person of ἐ]ρίζεϲθε.

59. E.g. Pindar *O.* 6.1–4; see Steiner (1986) 52–65.

] for the product was finished and
. .]. .[.]ι ραγε̣ι̣νο̣ν and λ. . . . was formed anew

Commentators on these lines have drawn attention, correctly, to the ethical connotations which the adjective ἐντελής "complete, perfect" may have.[60] However, this adjective is also especially appropriate to craftsmanship, and this sense is reinforced by the verb ἀνεπλάcθη. The presentation of verse as a perfected artifact here underscores the conceptualization of poetry as craft. So too does the verb ἀνεπλάcθη—meaning "formed, molded" and frequently "formed anew, refashioned."[61] Thus the verbal expression ἀνεπλάcθη evokes innovation on the part of the singer, a certain quality of the singer as free agent, yet an agent who nonetheless produces a composition that is ἐντελέc [complete, perfect], a term that connotes the aesthetic and ethical evaluations that pervade this poem. We need not separate the two levels of discourse. Callimachus appropriates the moralistic discourse of archaic iambic poetry for the

60. This adjective occurs once elsewhere in Callimachus, at *Hy.* 5.131:

ὣc φαμένα κατένευcε· τὸ δ' ἐντελέc, ᾧ κ' ἐπινεύcῃ
Παλλάc, ἐπεὶ μώνᾳ Ζεὺc τόγε θυγατέρων
δῶκεν Ἀθαναίᾳ πατρώια πάντα φέρεcθαι.

61. For the former sense of ἀναπλάccω, "to form, invent," cf. Dioscorides *A.P.* 7.410 (=20 G.-P.):

Θέcπις ὅδε, τραγικὴν ὃς ἀνέπλαcα πρῶτος ἀοιδήν
κωμήταις νεαρὰς καινοτομῶν χάριτας,
Βάκχος ὅτε † τριθῦν κατάγοι χορὸν ᾧ τράγος ἆθλον†
χὠττικὸς ἦν cύκων ἅρριχος ἆθλον ἔτι·
οἱ δὲ μεταπλάccουcι νέοι τάδε· μυρίος αἰών
πολλὰ προcευρήcει κἄτερα, τἀμὰ δ' ἐμά.

For the meaning of specifically refashioning to improve upon an original cf. Pl. *Alcib. I* 121d5–7 (on the upbringing of Persian royal children): οἷς [sc. τοῖς εὐνούχοις] τά τε ἄλλα προστέτακται ἐπιμέλεcθαι τοῦ γενομένου, καὶ ὅπως ὅτι κάλλιcτος ἔcται μηχανᾶcθαι, ἀναπλάττοντας τὰ μέλη τοῦ παιδὸς καὶ κατορθοῦντας and Alexis fr. 103 *PCG* (Ἰcοcτάcιον, see Arnott 273–83 for commentary) on the development and beautification of *hetairai:*

πρῶτα μὲν γὰρ πρὸc τὸ κέρδοc καὶ τὸ cυλᾶν τοὺc πέλαc
πάντα τἄλλ' αὐταῖc πάρεργα γίγνεται, ῥάπτουcι δέ
πᾶcιν ἐπιβουλάc. ἐπειδὰν δ' εὐπορήcωcίν ποτε,
ἀνέλαβον καινὰc ἑταίραc, πρωτοπείρουc τῆc τέχνηc·
εὐθὺc ἀναπλάττουcι ταύταc, ὥcτε μήτε τοὺc τρόπουc
μήτε τὰc ὄψειc ὁμοίαc διατελεῖν οὔcαc ἔτι.

For first with an eye to gain and to ripping off their neighbors
all else is of less import to these women, but they stitch together
schemes against everyone. And whenever they are well off,
they take on board new girls, virgins to the trade.
These they straightway make over, so thay they
continue neither in the same characters nor the same faces.

purpose of uttering aesthetic judgments; in the poetry of Hipponax he found a paradigm for this use of choliambic verse.

Callimachus employs imagery of craftsmanship as a metaphor for song elsewhere in his poetry.[62] Perhaps the most striking example is the description of the god Apollo as builder of cities (*Hy.* 2.55–64[63]), where in a feat of reversal of metaphor, the poet uses some of the traditional imagery of composition of song as a metaphor for building. In the context of *Iambus* 13 the use of this traditional metaphor adds one further element to the entire careful delineation of the poet and the true voice of his multifaceted art, a delineation that begins with the opening address to Apollo and the Muses and continues to the final first person utterance ἀείδω at 63. The poet calls attention to Ion specifically as a singer (45 οὐχ ἅπαξ . [. έ]κρουcε, 47 Λυδὸν] πρὸc αὐλὸν λ . . . . . κ̣αὶ χορδάc), as validation for his own song. The imagery and language of song belong in this poem only to Callimachus and to Ion, not to the disparager. The poet's critics rather appear as contentious and destructive, uttering only nonsense (40 τὰ νῦ]ν δὲ πολλὴν τυιφεδῶνα λεcχαίνειc) and effecting only the hunger-inducing scraps produced by the scraping of their fingertips.

Hesiodic Allusions

At 50–51 .]μ . [. .]ιπερημεν αἱ θεαὶ γὰρ ο̣[. .]κείνουc | .]ι̣. . νἠηαc ἠγάπηcαν αἱ τα̣. . αυτη the poet follows on the language and imagery of poetic craft of the previous lines with a reference to the Muses and their love, an evocation of the divine inspiration of singers. We should understand these lines that conclude the delineation of Ion as paradigm also as the bridge between paradigm and the poetic setting of *Iambus* 13. The first person voice at 33 δοκέω μὲν οὐδείc and the self-reference in 52–53 κἠμέ frame the paradigm, (whether this is understood as introduced immediately following 33 δοκέω μὲν οὐδείc, ἀλλὰ καὶ τόδε c̣κέψαι, or after an intermediate, and now irretrievably lost, step in the argument following 41]ὸ τεθμὸc οὗτοc[).

62. Two subtle examples of the use of this metaphor cluster occur elsewhere in the *Iambi:* one in the contest of Apollo with Hephaestus and the other gods in *Iambus* 12. 56–57, and one in the composition of *Iambus* 6. In *Iambus* 12 the poet emphasizes the aspect of craftsmanship in poetic composition both by having Apollo leave aside his own divine honors and by the god's competing directly in a contest of manufacturing skill (esp. lines 27–28 πολλὰ τ̣ε̣χνήεντα ποικ[ίλ]α γλ[υφῇ | παὶχν[ια] Τριτωνίc, lines 56–57 (suppl. in part *P. Mich.* inv. 4967 see Pf. Add. et Corr. II 118–19) χρεὼ cοφῆc ὦ Φοῖβε π. [. .].cθ. . τ̣έ̣χνηc | ἥτιc Ἡφαίcτεια νικήlc̣ει κ̣αλά.

63. For discussion of this passage see ch. 3, pp. 136–37, below.

Integral to Callimachus' use of paradigm is the frame in which he sets his example, particularly the first person voice of the framing structure. One characteristic of this structure that enhances the effect of the paradigm is a sympathetic quality of poetic voice and example, a shared experience highlighted in the frame. In *Iambus* 1 the Hipponactean poetic voice introduces as a paradigm the fable of Bathycles' cup with a reference to his own approaching return to Hades (34–35) δ[ε]ῖ | με γὰρ μέcον δινεῖν | [φεῦ φ]εῦ 'Αχέρο[ντ]οc. The actual recitation of the fable then opens almost immediately with Bathycles envisioning his approaching death (38–39) ἤδη καθίκ[ειν οὗτ]οc ἡνικ' ἤμελλεν | ἐc μακρὸν [ὄχθον]—καὶ γὰρ ε. . . οc ἔζωcε. The parallel allusions to death and journey to Hades effect a fluid quality in the boundary of frame and paradigm; the emphasis on shared experience heightens the association of poetic voice and example. The characterization of Bathycles as τῶν πάλαι τιc εὐδαίμων (35) and as a good man (assuming a reading at 39 such as Pfeiffer's ἐ[cθλ]ός) reflects back in a positive way on the narrative voice of the poem. The choice of exemplar gives valorization to the narrator's didactic stance.

We observe the same feature in the frame of the paradigm of Ion of Chios in *Iambus* 13. Lines 50–51 with their tantalizing and broken image of the Muses' love would seem to evoke a particular aspect of poetic inspiration. The occurrence of this image elsewhere in Callimachus' verse may shed light on our understanding here. As Dawson has observed, there appears to be a distinct recollection here of lines 37–38 of the *Aetia* prologue: . . . . . Μοῦcαι γὰρ ὅcουc ἴδον ὅθμαιτι παῖδαc | μὴ λοξῷ, πολιοὺc οὐκ ἀπέθεντο φίλουc.[64] These lines themselves recall Hesiod's delineation of the relationship of the Muses as conveyors of the powers of persuasive speech to good kings (*Theog.* 81–84).[65] The invocation of Hesiod, of the iconography of Muses and kings and of Muses and poets,[66] emblematizes the Hesiodic model in

64. Dawson (1950) 127.

65.

> ὅντινα τιμήcουcι Διὸς κοῦραι μεγάλοιο
> γεινόμενόν τ' ἐcίδωcι διοτρεφέων βαcιλήων,
> τῷ μὲν ἐπὶ γλώccῃ γλυκερὴν χείουcιν ἐέρcην,
> τοῦ δ' ἔπε' ἐκ cτόματοc ῥεῖ μείλιχα·

66.

> ὃ δ' ὄλβιοc, ὅντινα Μοῦcαι
> φίλωνται· γλυκερή οἱ ἀπὸ cτόματοc ῥέει αὐδή.
>
> Hes. *Theog.* 96–97

On the transitions from kings to singers in these lines see West (1966) 186–87.

which the Alexandrian poet is casting his own artistic creation. Callimachus answers his own refusal to try to imitate Homer's voice with the choice of another model, Hesiod. In these lines toward the end of the prologue and in the invocation of Hesiod's own *Dichterweihe* (fr. 2 Pf.), Callimachus places his work and his own poetic voice in another archaic tradition, that of Hesiod. Callimachus evokes this tradition as well when demonstrating his approbation of other poets, famously of Aratus in *Ep.* 27 Pf. (56 G.-P),[67] and, I suggest, of Ion of Chios in *Iambus* 13. While proffering Ion of Chios as his model, Callimachus here at the conclusion of the paradigm gives a Hesiodic cast to both his own voice and Ion's. He places both his model and himself in a poetic tradition that transcends the critical observations of his opponents.

With imagery of rage and slander the poet returns to the iambic setting, and to the setting of censure and self-defense. Here the poet speaks of his opponents in the third person, it is *their* behavior that signifies madness and drives away the Muses—a reversal of roles from the critic's speech, which culminates in the poet's appropriation of the critic's charges as grounds for self-definition.[68] And at the opening of this final passage, amid stock iambic features, Hesiod is again a valorizing presence. Line 53 may in κοτέω]ν ἀοιδῷ [angry with singer] contain a carefully wrought allusion to lines 25–26 of the proem of Hesiod's *Works and Days,* καὶ κεραμεὺc κεραμεῖ κοτέει καὶ τέκτονι τέκτων, | καὶ πτωχὸc πτωχῷ φθονέει καὶ ἀοιδὸc ἀοιδῷ [and potter vies with potter and builder with builder, and beggar envies beggar and singer envies singer]. Pfeiffer and others have noted the allusion to the Hesiodic passage; it is, however, complex and deserves close reading. Callimachus plays on the remarkable alliteration of these lines of Hesiod in the repetition of the initial κ in κ̲έραc, κ̲οτέω]ν, κ̲ὴμέ (possibly also with the initial τ in τεθύμωται and ταπρᾳχ̣ . . . [ ); further the images of fat and famine in line 60 (τοῦδ' οὕνεκ' οὐδὲν πῖον, ἀ[λλὰ] λιμηρά̣ [for which reason nothing fat, but famine-causing bits]) take on an additional layer of meaning when read against the Hesiodic passage, the portrayal of the good Eris, a passage textured by images of wealth and lack:

67.

> Ἡcιόδου τό τ' ἄειcμα καὶ ὁ τρόποc· οὐ τὸν ἀοιδῶν
> ἔcχατον, ἀλλ' ὀκνέω μὴ τὸ μειλιχρότατον
> τῶν ἐπέων ὁ Cολεὺc ἀπεμάξατο· χαίρετε λεπταί
> ῥήcιεc, Ἀρήτου cύμβολον ἀγρυπνίηc.
>
> Callim. *Ep.* 27 Pf. (56 G.-P.)

68. Again Solon's iambic poetry provides some remarkable parallels.

ἥ τε καὶ ἀπάλαμόν περ ὁμῶς ἐπὶ ἔργον ἐγείρει.
εἰς ἕτερον γάρ τίς τε ἴδεν ἔργοιο χατίζων
πλούσιον, ὃς σπεύδει μὲν ἀρώμεναι ἠδὲ φυτεύειν
οἰκόν τ' εὖ θέσθαι, ζηλοῖ δέ τε γείτονα γείτων
εἰς ἄφενος σπεύδοντ'· ἀγαθὴ δ' Ἔρις ἥδε βροτοῖσιν.
καὶ κεραμεὺς κεραμεῖ κοτέει καὶ τέκτονι τέκτων,
καὶ πτωχὸς πτωχῷ φθονέει καὶ ἀοιδὸς ἀοιδῷ.
Hes. *Works and Days* 20–26

Even the helpless man she urges on nonetheless to his work.
For one man sees another wealthy and being himself
without work, he is eager to plow or to plant,
and to set his house in order. Neighbor emulates neighbor
in eagerness for wealth. This Eris is a source of good for mortals.
And potter vies with potter and builder with builder,
and beggar envies beggar and singer envies singer.

Here the good Eris urges on even the inept to behavior at once constructive and remunerative; Hesiod clearly means to bring the contention of artisan with artisan in line with that of farmer envying farmer at line 23.[69] In the Callimachean passage by contrast, the activity of strife is characterized as paltry and even destructive. The allusion is not only to the emulous behavior of artisans with one another in the Hesiodic characterization of the good Eris, but indirectly to the bad Eris as well.

We may make two further points concerning this allusion to the *Works and Days*. Callimachus has refashioned the original; he has rendered a characterization of imitative behavior that recalls Hesiod and is at the same time a reworking of Hesiod. Hesiod gives the competition of artisan with artisan as one of the qualities of the good Eris. In *Iambus* 13 this competition among poets has turned sour, and results, as in *Iambus* 1, in behavior that is not constructive but simply negative. This refashioning of the original is a salient parallel to the poet's characterization of purely imitative choliambic. An attempt merely to imitate Hipponax is obviated by temporal and spatial distance; Callimachus can evoke this distance as the ground for his own innovation.

At the same time we have not only one but two allusions in these closing lines of *Iambus* 13 to renowned openings of Hesiodic works, indirectly to the *Theogony* in the delineation of the Muses' love (50–51) and directly to the opening of the *Works and Days* (52–53). The role of Hesiod for Callimachus is one that continues to garner much attention in Callimachean scholarship, yet these two examples have been curiously overlooked. Simply put, it is by evoking Hesiod that Calli-

69. Even if, as West (1978) 147 observes, the concepts of κότος and φθόνος are "not in the spirit of the good Eris."

machus sets his critical imprimatur on his own legitimacy as a poetic voice (the *Somnium,* fr. 2 Pf., being an obvious example) and on the work of his contemporaries (cf. *Ep.* 27.1 Pf. = 56 G.-P. Ἡcιόδου τό τ' ἄειcμα καὶ ὁ τρόποc on the poet Aratus of Soli). The evocation of Hesiod in these lines of *Iambus* 13 gives a quality of legitimacy to Callimachus' own poetic voice, and, both surprisingly and yet most effectively, to his voice as an iambographer—the legitimacy of the poetic genius transcends any artificially structured boundaries. Hesiod's presence is a validating authority in elegy, epigram, or, here, iambic.

On Not Going to Ephesus

The poet concludes his paradigm, the portrayal of Ion of Chios, at or shortly after line 50 and returns to his self-defense against his critic. As in *Iambus* 1, a remarkable presence of iambic language and imagery follows the conclusion of the paradigm, highlighting, even pronouncing, the change from one context to another. The imagery of the Muses and their love, an imagery that affects both paradigmatic figure and narrative voice, serves as the bridge from paradigm to contextual frame. Translations of these lines tend to miss the point of line 53 κἠμέ; here the narrative voice reinserts its own presence into the text. The poet is himself the object of his critic's derogatory comments.

In this last part of *Iambus* 13 Callimachus reconfigures the charges of the critic's speech in a derisive assessment of his critic, his critic's statements and behavior, appropriating not only his critic's imagery but finally his critic's own words. At 58–59 πα̣ρέπτηcαν | καὐταὶ τρομεῦcα̣ι μὴ κακῷ̣c ἀ̣κούcωcι [have flown by and themselves tremble lest they be badly spoken of] the Muses show the same revulsion before the poet's critic that the poet feels himself. The image surely reflects the last line of the critic's speech (22) in a final act of appropriation of the Muses and their poetic authority.[70] Their conduct deprives the poet's adversaries of true inspiration, and of the richness (60 πῖον) of both human and divine plenty in Homeric epic.[71] Left to an onomatopoetic clawing of unsatisfying bits (line 61), theirs is the exclusion from the place of true poets and true poetry.

Line 62 ὡc τῆc ἐλαίηc, ἣ ἀνέπαυcε τ̣ὴν Λητώ [as though from the olive tree, which gave rest to Leto] directly recalls line 84 of *Iambus* 4

70. There is a similarity in sound and metrical pattern in line 59 μὴ κακῷ̣c ἀ̣κούcωcι to lines 14 (spoken by the critic) and 66 (spoken by the poet) μὴ ἀμαθῶc ἐναύ̣ονται, another example of appropriation in this eristic setting.

71. Cf. also Solon fr. 37 W.

τὸ τ]ῆc ἐλαίηc ἣ ἀν[έπαυc]ε τὴν Λητώ. The line is itself a remarkable moment of intertextual self-referencing. Callimachus recalls in the context of one agonistic setting, the debate of poet and critic in *Iambus* 13, another agon on questions of poetics, and especially Callimachean poetics, the agon of laurel and olive in *Iambus* 4. In that poem the olive tree is not only one of the contestants in the agon, but is the contestant that prevails. *Iambus* 13 looks back on the *Iambi* as a collection, both in general description (lines 17–18) and through specific echo, especially of *Iambus* 1; in closing with this allusion to the contest of the laurel and the olive the poet reconfigures one poetic debate in terms of another. The tree that gave rest to the mother of Apollo, the patron god of singers, is the olive; in the agon of *Iambus* 4 Callimachus contrasts the simplicity of the olive's statements with the anger and bombast of the laurel. In the final lines of *Iambus* 13 the poet's opponents by their behavior exclude themselves from this source of inspiration; even their clawing is rewarded only with further hunger. The two poems share in their agonistic character declarative outlines of successful and failed argumentation and definitions of successful and failed art.

We may carry the discussion of self-reference in this line even further. The birth of Apollo on Delos, (here, however, Leto leans against the φοῖνιξ, the Delian palm), and the physical violation of the sacred olive tree are both themes of Callimachus' *Hymn* 4 (*to Delos*). The wanderings of Leto, the birth of Apollo, and the deliberately intertwined hymnic praises to Apollo and to Ptolemy II Philadelphus are the larger themes of this hymn.[72] The line twice repeated in the *Iambi,* ὡc τῆc ἐλαίηc, ἣ ἀνέπαυcε τὴν Λητώ, may be read on one level as a general reference to *Hymn* 4 and to Callimachus' delineation of his own close relationship to the god Apollo in this hymn. This same line has as well a more specific reference. *Hymn* 4 closes (lines 316–26) with a description of a ritual on Delos in which sailors with their hands tied behind them circle the altar of Asteria and, while being beaten, attempt to take bites out of the sacred trunk of the olive tree.[73]

> Ἀcτερίη πολύβωμε πολύλλιτε, τίc δέ cε ναύτηc
> ἔμποροc Αἰγαίοιο παρήλυθε νηὶ θεούcῃ;
> οὐχ οὕτω μεγάλοι μιν ἐπιπνείουcιν ἀῆται,
> χρειὼ δ' ὅττι τάχιcτον ἄγει πλόον, ἀλλὰ τὰ λαίφη
> ὠκέεc ἐcτείλαντο καὶ οὐ πάλιν αὖτιc ἔβηcαν,
> πρὶν μέγαν ἢ cέο βωμὸν ὑπὸ πληγῇcιν ἑλίξαι
> ῥηccόμενον καὶ πρέμνον ὀδακτάcαι ἀγνὸν ἐλαίηc

72. Bing (1988) 91–143.

73. See *Hymn* 4 scholia, W. H. Mineur, *Callimachus: Hymn to Delos* (Leiden, 1984), 245–52.

χεῖραc ἀποcτρέψαντα[c]· ἃ Δηλιὰc εὕρετο νύμφη
παίγνια κουρίζοντι καὶ Ἀπόλλωνι γελαcτύν.
ἱcτίη ὦ νήcων εὐέcτιε, χαῖρε μὲν αὐτή,
χαίροι δ' Ἀπόλλων τε καὶ ἣν ἐλοχεύcαο[74] Λητώ.

Asteria of many altars, of many prayers, what merchant sailor
of the Aegean has passed by you with swift ship?
Such great winds do not blow upon him,
but though need urges the swiftest voyage, yet they swiftly
furl their sails, and do not go back on board,
before they circle your great altar beaten with blows
and bite the sacred trunk of the olive
with their hands bound back. These things the Delian nymph
devised for the play and laughter of the youthful Apollo.
O prosperous hearth of islands, hail yourself,
and hail Apollo and she whom you, Leto, bore.

The parallel of the repeated line of the *Iambi,* ὡc τῆc ἐλαίηc, ἣ ἀνέπαυcε τὴν Λητώ, and the final line of the fourth hymn, χαίροι δ' Ἀπόλλων τε καὶ ἣν ἐλοχεύcαο Λητώ, is a striking one on several levels. On a linguistic level these two lines in themselves are examples of the Hellenistic love of *imitatio* and *variatio.* The position of the name of the goddess as the final word of the line is the same, as is the position of the relative pronoun. So too is the position in the line of the transitive verb. The verb itself in the *Iambi* is a different one with a metaphorically synonymous sense. Callimachus develops the *variatio* also through the different meter, in itself a subtle intrusion of the poet's *polyeideia.* The line twice repeated in the *Iambi* is in character hymnic, but occurs in a choliambic setting. In the case of *Iambus* 13 this line represents a final transgression of generic boundary, the very charge that Callimachus has put in his critic's mouth, a transgression that is indicative here of the finesse of the poet's art rather than the lack thereof.

At issue in any discussion of the recollection here is the dating of the poems. Unfortunately here a degree of conjecture is inevitable. For *Hymn* 4 there is a *terminus post quem* of 275 B.C.E., the year that saw the mutiny of the Gauls at the Nile, an event the yet unborn Apollo prophesies in the poem.[75] P. Bing has posited a *terminus ante quem* of 259 B.C.E.

74. The exact reading is controversial. The mss. have ἐλοχεύcατο, and the passage has often been understood as a reference to the birth of Artemis. See Mineur (1984) 251–52. The line in the *Iambi,* largely overlooked in discussions of this line of the fourth hymn, would, in my opinion, lend some weight to the reading that keeps Asteria (Delos) the subject, *pace* Mineur (1984) 252. The uncertainty of the reading does not in any event affect my interpretation.

75. *Hymn* 4.171–87. On this passage see L. Koenen "Die Adaption ägyptischer Königsideologie am Ptolemäerhof," in *Egypt and the Hellenistic World,* ed. E. van't Dack,

(the conquest of Corsica by Cn. Cornelius Scipio).[76] There is, however, no firm internal or external evidence for the original date of composition of the *Iambi,*[77] and, of course, the *Iambi* may have been subject to revision or reediting.

I suggest that the repeated line of the *Iambi* ὡc τῆc ἐλαίηc, ἣ ἀνέπαυcε τὴν Λητώ must, for effect of the allusion, be meant to echo the final line and contextual setting of *Hymn* 4 χαίροι δ' Ἀπόλλων τε καὶ ἣν ἐλοχεύcαο Λητώ. The evocation of the hymn, and, indeed, of its author, lends a degree of poetic authority to the Callimachean voice at the end of *Iambus* 13 that is incontestable. For no other of Callimachus' extant poems so consciously delineates the bond of poet to divine voice as *Hymn* 4. The remarkable feat that Callimachus achieves with this evocation here is to transfer something of the level of elevation of *Hymn* 4 to the context of his own programmatic statement as a poet of choliambics. The poet need not resort to blind imitation, as he has divinely inspired artistic genius in his own right.

Iambus 13 finally and culminatingly concludes in a *virtuoso* example of Callimachean literary allusion and self-reflexivity in the reconfiguration of a set phrase, here the words of the critic, to a novel end, the self-definition of the poet himself. Callimachus achieves a similar effect in the prologue to the *Aetia* with the justification of the slight (fr. 1.24 Pf. λεπταλέην) over the grandiosely heroic (fr. 1.23 πάχιcτον);[78] the repetition at the end of *Iambus* 13 is, however, more elaborate. The critic's charge is a complex one—the poet has not been to the

---

P. van Dessel, and W. van Gucht (Louvain, 1983), 174–90; on dating the hymn see Bing (1988) 91–93, and on the revolt Bing (1988) 128–39 and Mineur (1984) 16–18.

76. Bing (1988) 92–93 argues that Corsica at *Hy.* 4.19 ἡ δ'ὄπιθεν Φοίνιccα μετ' ἴχνια Κύρνοc ὀπηδεῖ would not probably be so called after the conquest by Scipio.

77. Cf., however, Cameron (1995) 163, 171–73.

78. The contextual play in the *Aetia* prologue 3–6 is especially noteworthy in its similar character to the passage at the end of *Iambus* 13:

> εἵνεκεɹν οὐχ ἓν ἄειcμα διηνεκὲc ἢ βαcιλ[η
> . . . . .]αc ἐν πολλαῖc ἴνυcα χιλιάcιν
> ἢ . . . . .] . ουc ἤρωαc, ἔποc δ' ἐπὶ τυτθὸν ἑλ[ίccω
> παῖc ἄτɹε, τῶν δ' ἐτέων ἡ δεκὰιcɹ οὐκ ὀλίγη.
>
> because I did not accomplish in many thousands of lines
> . . . one drawn-out song of kings
> . . . or heroes, but draw out a little tale
> like a child, though the decades of my years are not few.

At the end of the poem Callimachus turns the accusation of his critic that he writes in the manner of a child on its head with the declaration of the enduring love of the Muses for the poet from childhood to old age (lines 37–38). The παῖδαc in line 37 recalls the παῖc of line 6; however, the accusation is now turned to self-definition and affirmation.

archaic source of choliambic inspiration, and thus does not write true choliambic. The latter part of *Iambus* 13 is, as we have observed, a self-delimitation of the poet's artistic genius that transcends boundaries spatial, temporal, and generic all at once; the final lines of the poem set apart the truly inspired from those who strive in vain (note again the paradoxical μὴ ἀμαθῶς) to attain that which will ever elude them.

THREE

The Elevated Paradigm

Iambi 12 and 1 (lines 32–77)

In the previous chapters I discussed the two *Iambi* that are particularly concerned with the iambographic persona and the composition of iambic verse, *Iambus* 1 (in this case largely limiting my analysis to the narrative frame surrounding the parable of Bathycles' cup) and *Iambus* 13. Callimachus composes these poems in response to the tradition of choliambic poetry, and especially to the figure of Hipponax. Further, in both *Iambi* Callimachus defines and fashions a voice in reaction to Hipponax and Hipponactean verse. We may designate these verses, the frame of *Iambus* 1 and the whole of *Iambus* 13, the "Hipponactean" passages of the *Iambi,* which are not only composed in this tradition, but which self-referentially comment on their own composition within it.

In the following two chapters my study changes to an area of discussion at once similar to and different from the last. The larger subject is again the character of poetic composition and the interaction of poets. The manner of presentation, or illustration of intent, of the poetic voice, however, is different. At the center of each of the four poems I read in these chapters is an extended narrative paradigm. In *Iambus* 12 and the tale of Bathycles' cup from *Iambus* 1, a parable taken from the plane of divine or legendary agents illustrates the poet's message. In *Iambi* 2 and 4 Callimachus draws a paradigmatic example from fable, one of the traditional components of iambic verse. All four poems employ paradigm for a didactic purpose, but the first two take their paradigms from a more elevated plane, the second two from simpler kinds of expression. In all four poems Callimachus transcends boundaries traditionally established by the use of high or low exempla, and at the same time the continued interweaving and contextual play with the "high" and the "low" repeatedly foregrounds the seemingly paradoxical quality of iambic verse as a medium for poetic discourse.

The two poems I discuss in this chapter draw analogy from elevated paradigms, paradigms that direct the audience's gaze to the plane of

the divine (*Iambus* 12) or inherited wisdom literature (*Iambus* 1). The paradigms share a number of features: manner of narrative introduction, a gathering of figures as setting, a catalogue of those involved in the central act of giving, and the role of Apollo and his cult. One component that particularly suggests viewing these narratives together is the importance of objects of art—their symbolism, their creation, and their presentation as gifts. In *Iambus* 1 a golden cup is the intended gift for the best of the Seven Sages; each hands the cup on to the next until it is finally enshrined at Didyma, as an offering to Apollo. Virtue, as symbolized by an object of artistic creation (line 77 τοῦτο . . . ἀριστῆον), lies at the end in divine, not mortal, hands. In *Iambus* 12 the Olympian gods contend with one another in giving gifts to the newly born Hebe; the song of Apollo, the gift that will last forever, prevails over the playthings the other gods have intricately wrought from "mortal" material. Both narratives illustrate a benign Eris, a contest with a result at once constructive and exemplary. Both rewrite a mythical example in terms of Callimachean poetics and the poet's own self-fashioning.

Iambus 12 (fr. 202 Pf.)

⏑— ῎Αρτειμι Κρηταῖον ᾽Αμνιcοῦ πέδον
ἥ τε Δικτ̣[
τιμίη. [
ἥ ce του. [
ἰμcτίη λ. [
᾽.]. . [
. . . . . .
. . . . .]. γὰρ[. . .]. αινοι πόλειc
. . . . .]κ̣ου μο̣[. .]. . οὔρεα βλέπει
. . . .]. μεc ὦ̃ κά̣[λ]λ̣ιcτα νήθ̣ουcαι μ̣υ̣[
. . . . .]ο̣υρειηcι̣. [. . .]. . χθονόc
. .]θετ᾽ οὐχ 'ὑμὴν' ἀ̣[
καὶ θέμιν καὶ πᾳ̣[
τῶνδ᾽ ἄναξ . υδ᾽ οι̣[. . .]. . [.]ο̣υ̣c̣[
φαυ̣λ̣. . . β. . [.]ι̣ . ναποι̣. . [.]. [. .]. ουc
ἔcτιν οικ[. . .]. ι. . . ἀψευ̣δέα λέγων
καὶ τάφο[ν τὸ]ν Κ[ρ]ῆ̣τα γινώcκειν κενόν
φηcὶ καὶ πατρῷ̣[ο]ν̣ οὐ κτείνει Δία·
τοὔνεκ᾽ ἀντήc̣[αιτε] πρηεῖαι, θεαί,
τῆcδ᾽ ἐτῆ̣c εὐχῇ̣[cι.]. . ἀ̣είcομαι
Μ̣οῦcα τῇ̣ μικκῇ̣ τι τε. . ηναι μελ̣[
ἡνίκ᾽ αἰ̣[. . .]υ[.]α τὴν γενεθλίην
ἑβδόμην ῾Ήρ[η] θ̣[υγ]ατρὸc ἡμέρην

Text: *P. Oxy.* 2218 preserves lines 1–6; line 1 is supplemented by the lemma of the Diegesis. *P. Oxy.* 1011 contains lines 7–86. *P. Mich.* inv. 4967 adds enormously to the text of lines 57–70. See Pfeiffer Add. et Corr., II 118–19. It is possible that fr. 204 Pf. may belong to the end of *Iambus* 12.

Meter: trochaic trimeter catalectic. At one time scholars hesitated to assign this poem to the collection of *Iambi* (see Clayman [1980] 4–7, Dawson [1950] 105–6). This is, however, a meter cited for Archilochus (fr. 197 W.). There was no hesitation in antiquity in assigning poetry in trochaic meters to collections of *iamboi;* see West (1974) 22–39 passim.

Dialect: literary Ionic.

2 ἥ τε Δικτ̣[Pfeiffer's suggests "fort. ἥ τε Δικτ[υνναῖον ἀμφέπειc ὄροc vel sim. potius quam Δικτ[αῖον; Δίκτ[ην metri causa legi nequit. . . . " I follow this suggestion in my translation of this line.

5 ἰμcτίη λ . Pfeiffer suggests (Add. et Corr. I 506) reading ἰcτίῃ Λέ̣[οντοc following Λέοντι γνωρίμῳ in the Diegesis.

9 καὶ ὕμ]μεc "(Barber et Smiley) spatio et sensui convenit." Pfeiffer Add. et Corr. II 118.

Artemis, who [goes about] the Cretan plain of Amnisus
and [mount] Dicte[
honored [
who you του. [
hearth λ. [
΄.]. . [
. . . . . .
. . . . .]. for [. . .]. αινοι cities
. . . . .]κ̣ου μ̣ο̣[. .]. . looks upon mountains
[and you], O spinning most beautiful μ̣υ̣[
. . . . .]ο̣υρειηcι̣. [. . .]. . χθονόc
. .]θετ’ not “Hymen” ἀ̣[
both right and πᾳ̣[
lord of these . υδ’ οι̣[. . .]. . [.]ο̣υ̣c̣[
paltry (?) . . . β. . [.]ι̣ . ναποι̣ . . [.]. [. .]. ουc
there is οικ[. . .]. ι. . . saying things which are not false
and says he knows the Cretan grave is empty
and does not kill the Zeus of his fathers.
Wherefore may you gently receive, goddesses,
these true prayers . . I will sing
Muse something for the little girl τε. . ηναι μελ̣[
when Hera [was preparing] the feast of the seventh day
after her daughter’s birth

11 'ὑμήν' Cf. fr. 473 Pf., a comment from one of the Greek grammarians (Apollon. Dysc.) which attests the use of the wedding address ὑμέν/ὑμήν in Callimachus. Rea and Parsons however read ὑμεῖν (i.e. ὑμῖν). This has the advantage of removing a reference to one ritual in the context of another.

17 κτείνει Δία J. Rea, P. Parsons, and R. Coles now read κτείνει Δία for the very problematic κτείνειν ὄφι̣ν of Pfeiffer’s text. Ultraviolet light photography shows the seeming descender of the φ to be vestigial ink.

18 πρη̣εῖαι, θεαί Apparently the Fates. Cf. line 9 ὦ κά̣[λ]λ̣ιcτα νήθουcαι.

19 Kerkhecker (1999) 229 makes the attractive suggestion εὐχῇ̣[c’, ἐγ]ὼ̣ δ̣’ ἀείcομαι; ἀείcομαι finds a response in ἤειcα at line 74.

20 Μ̣οῦcα R. Coles and J. Rea suggest the reading δ̣οῦcα rather than the apparently vocative Μ̣οῦcα here, which removes this second vocative (cf. line 18 θεαί), from these lines altogether. δ̣οῦcα might then modify Ἥρ[η] in line 22.

21 αι̣[. . .]υ[.]α Smiley suggested ἀρ[τύο]υ[c]α “preparing.” cf. *Hymn* 6.78 ἐπεὶ γάμον ἄρτυε παιδί.

ῃ[. .]ν οἱ δ’ Ὄλυμπον ῃ̣τ̣ . c . . . . . οι
ῃ[. . .] . [.] τίc πᾳ̣ι̣ . [. καλ]λ̣ίcτῃ δ̣ό̣cει
π . [. .] . α τιμήcει τ̣[. . .]. . . . . ερο. [
Ζεὺc πατὴρ οὐ φαυ. . . . [. . . . .]. . [
πολλὰ τ̣εχνήεντα ποικ[ίλ]α γλ[υφῇ
παίχν[ια] Τριτωνὶc ἤνεικεν κόρ[
πολλὰ δ̣’ . . . . . ιου πυλωρὸc αὐχένο[c
ἔκ τε τῆc. . . . [.]. . [.]. . . . . [.]ηc ἁλόc
καὶ τὸ Τυρc̣ην. [.]. . . . . [. .]. . . . [
c̣[.] π̣ν̣ι̣. . χ̣’. . . . . c̣ ἐκβ̣ά̣λλ. . [
παίχνια χρυcοῖο τιμηέc[τ]ερ̣[α
μυρίην λ̣. . . ᾠδε ῥ̣η̣. [.]. [
ῥ̣η̣δίωc λ[.]. . α̣ι γὰρ ηλ. [
πολλὰ κα. α̣. . [. . .]ρ̣oc α̣[
ἤγαγον μύθοιc̣[ι. . . . .]. . ψ[.]λ̣ . .
ο[ῖ]cι τῆc μουνη[. . . . .]. ιγεν δάκρυ
παιδὸc η. [. . . . .] ληιcτῆc̣[
ἵππoc α̣c̣τ̣ι̣[. . . .]δ̣[. .]η̣ν [.]. κ̣η̣ν κρο. [.].
ἦλθε χὠ τακ̣[. . . .] . . . . . .
πάντα κα[.]. . [. . . .]. [. . . . .]. ψ’ ἄ[γ]ων
ἐργάτηc. [.] . λ̣ιc̣τ̣oc οἷcι κυ[. .]. ν
ταc[. . .]η c̣τ̣έψει cε̣ cιγηc̣. . . . . [. . .].
οἱ δ’ ι. [. . γ]λυκεῖαν̣ ἀλλήλοιc ἔριν
θ]έντεc ἡμ[ι]λλῶντ̣ο δω[τί]νη[c πέρι.
Δ]ήλι’ ὤπολλον, cὺ δ’ ε̣cκλ̣[. .]. ευμ. . [
ὅcc̣α] τοι Πυθῶνoc ἀρχα[ίηc ἔ]cω
κτη]μάτων ἔκειτο. [. .]. ι̣πον ρ̣υ̣[
]. ιπεc. [ ]. . [ ]ερ̣ο̣ντιcοι
]. ἠΰτει τρίπουc

23–25 Several attractive conjectures have been put forth to complete these fragmentary lines that appear to open the divine contest of gift-giving. These include ἦ[γε]ν (Barber), ἤρ[ι]cα̣ν̣ θ̣εοί | ἥ[μεν]ο̣[ι] (Pfeiffer), τίc πᾳ̣ὶ̣δ̣[α (Lobel), πρ̣[επ]τ̣ὰ (Pfeiffer). This would give the following reconstruction of these lines, which I have followed in the translation.

ἦ[γε]ν οἱ δ’ Ὄλυμπον ἤρ[ι]cα̣ν̣ θ̣εοί
ἥ[μεν]ο̣[ι] τίc πᾳ̣ὶ̣δ̣[α καλ]λ̣ίcτῃ δ̣ό̣cει
πρ̣[επ]τ̣ὰ τιμήcει τ̣[. . .]. . . . . ερο. [

26 E.g., φαῦλον ὤπαcεν τέλοc | κράτοc, cf. Nonn. *Dion* 5.127 (πάντα τέλεια), Barber. The other occasions where the adjective φαῦλος appears in *Iambus* 12 are also contextually associated with Zeus: line 60 of the corrupting effects of gold, which

[the gods sitting on] Olympus [quarreled]
"Who will honor the [extraordinary] child
with the most beautiful gift τ̣[. . .]. . . . . ερο. [?"
Father Zeus not [a paltry result provided?]
The Tritonian maid brought many toys
artful and variously wrought by carving
and many . . . . . ιου the keeper of the isthmus
and from the . . . . [.]. . [.]. . . . . [.]ηc of the sea
and the Tyrrhenian. [.]. . . . . [. .]. . . . [
c̣[.] π̣ν̣ι̣. . χ̣'. . . . . c̣ cast out . . [
playthings more to be honored than gold[
countless λ̣ . . . ω̣δε ρ̣η̣. [.]. [
easily λ[.]. . α̣ι for ηλ. [
many κα. α̣. . [. . .]ρ̣oc α̣[
they brought with words [. . . . .] [in abundance]
among whom alone [. . . . .]. ιγεν a tear
for her child η. [. . . . .] pirated [
a horse αc̣τ̣ι̣[. . . .]δ̣[. .]η̣ν [.]. κ̣η̣ν κρο. [.].
and came the ταḳ[. . . .] . . . . . .
all κα[.]. . [. . . .]. [. . . . .]. ψ' the workman
[Hephaestus] leading with which κυ[. .]. ν
ταc[. . .]η will crown you [having been silent?]. . . . . [. . .] .
And they [on equal footing] contended with one another
making sweet strife of the gift-giving.
But you, Delian Apollo, ε̣cκλ̣[. .]. ευμ. . [
however so many of your possessions lay
within ancient Pytho. [. .]. ι̣πον ρ̣υ̣[
] . ιπεc. [ ] . . [ ]ερ̣ο̣ντ̣ιcοι
]. the tripod cried out

will dwell in a house of little worth (φαῦλον οἰκήcει δόμον) and fail to honor Justice and Zeus (line 62 καὶ Δίκην καὶ Ζῆνα), and apparently line 14 φαυ̣λ̣. . . in a context centered around Zeus, here of the false Cretan grave.

29 [καὶ Ἀπ]ίου E. A. Barber's conjecture, "Callimachea Varia," *CR,* n.s., 5 (1955): 242. R. Coles reads πολλὰ δ̣' (there is an apostrophe in the papyrus), in which case certainly the καί of Barber's conjectured [καὶ Ἀπ]ίου will not stand. For Poseidon and Corinth in Callimachus cf. fr. 384 *(The Victory of Sosibius)* lines 1–15.

37 . . ψ[.]λ̣. . Lloyd-Jones suggests δαψιλ. (δαψιλῆ with πολλὰ in the previous line?)

38 ιγεν Rea reads π̣τεν.

45 Following Pfeiffer's suggestion "ἴc̣[οι 'in contentione pares' ἠμιλλῶντο (cf. ἰcάμιλλοι)."

51 ἠΰτει τρίπουc See Pfeiffer for parallels to this image of tripod's cry.

]. οι δ' ὑπώροφοι
.] τ̣α̣τ̣ο. . [. . . .]. ε̣. ἐφ[θέγ]ξω τ[ά]δε·
'.]χειcθ[.]. [.]οιc̣[.]. . [.] . οιcιν α. τε̣[. . . .]ι̣ρ̣ι̣α
. εcθ', ἐγὼ δ' ἄλλην τιν' ο[.]. ηc[ω. . .]ιν.
χρεὼ cοφῆc ὦ Φοῖβε π. [. .]. cθ. . τ̣έ̣χνηc
ἥτιc Ἡφαίcτεια νικήι̣c̣ε̣ι̣ κ̣α̣λά.
αὐτίκα χρυcὸν μὲν Ἰνδιικοὶ κύνεc
βυccόθεν μύρμηκεc οι[ΐcου]cι πτεροῖc·
πολλάκιc καὶ φαῦλον οι̣ικήcει δόμον
χρυcός, ἀρχαίουc δ' ἀτιμήcει [ ]c·
καὶ Δίκην καὶ Ζῆνα καὶ ι [. . .]ο̣υ̣. α̣. αc
ὑπτίῳ παίcαντεc ἄνθιρωποι ποδί
χρυcὸν αἰνήcουcι τίμι̣ιον κ. . . . [.
τὴν Ἀθηναίηc δὲ καὶ ἐτιέρων δόcιν̣,
καίπερ εὖ cμίλη̣cιν ἠικ̣ριβ̣ωμένην,
ὁ πρόcω φοιτέων ἀμαυιρώcει χρ̣[ό]νοc·
ἡ δ'ἐμὴ τῇ̣ παιδὶ καλλίιcτη δόcι̣ς̣,
ἔcτ' ἐμὸν γένειον ἀγνεύη ι τριχόc
καὶ ἐρίφοιc χαίρωcιν ἅρπιαγ[εc λ]ύκ̣[ο]ι
. . . .]τεων. . [.]. . [.]. . [.]. ι̣ο̣ς̣ πόδαc
. . . . .]. . . τ̣ο̣ν. μπλ. . [.]c μ̣ό̣λ̣ι̣c
. [ ]. [.]. ν cε̣ νύμφα. . . [.]. . . c
. [. .]δ̣[ ]. c. οιcιν ἤειcα. . c̣ο̣. .
οἱ δ' ι̣[ ]η̣ π[αι]δ̣ὶ̣ νικάτω τα[.]
ων. [ ]. ηραμοι. . . . . [

52 ὑπώροφοι Cf. Pindar *P.* 1.97–98 οὐδέ νιν φόρμιγγες ὑπωρόφιαι κοινανίαν | μαλθακὰν παίδων ὀάροισι δέκονται.

53 ἐφ[θέγ]ξω Von Arnim's supplement is a particularly attractive one given the use of this verb elsewhere in Callimachus.

55 .εcθ' Surely θέcθ' "you (you other gods) set forth (perhaps gifts of another kind from the previous line), but I (Apollo) will provide some other (i.e., different kind) of gift." The same contrast is of course the theme of lines 56–57 and 65–70.

58 Ἰνδιικοὶ κύνεc Although the primary (and prose) meaning of κύων is "dog," in poetry this term can apply to any wondrous creature such as the eagle of Zeus [Aesch. *Pr.* 1021–22 Διὸc δέ τοι | πτηνὸc κύων], or griffins [Aesch. *Pr.* 803 Ζηνὸc ἀκραγεῖc κύναc]. This is the preferable sense of the word here.

61 Assuming a noun such as νόμους or τρόπους at the end of line 61; see Pfeiffer in his commentary to *P. Mich.* 4967 Add. et Corr. II 118.

]. οι and under the roof
.] τατο. . [. . . .]. ε. you uttered the following:
“.]χειcθ[.]. [.]οιc[.]. . [.].οιcιν α. τε[. . . .]ιρια
.εcθ’, but I will [provide?] some other [gift].
There is need now, Phoebus, of wise π. [. .]. cθ. . craft
which will prevail over the fair Hephaestean gifts.
Straightway the ants, the monsters of India,
will bear gold from the depths on their wings.
And often gold will inhabit a house
of little worth, and will dishonor venerable [usage].
Men, while striking with upturned foot
both Justice and Zeus καὶ ι [. . .]ου. α. αc
will praise gold as honorable [and] κ. . . . [.
The gift of Athena and of the others,
even though executed with such precision with chisels,
time as it goes forward will render dim.
But my gift for the girl, the most beautiful,
so long as my chin is innocent of hair,
and so long as rapacious wolves delight in kids,
. . . .]τεων. . [.]. . [.]. . [.]. ιος feet
. . . . .]. . . τον. μπλ. . [.]c scarcely
.[ ]. [.]. ν you [acc.] the nymphs? . . . [.]. . . c
.[. .]δ[ ]. c. οιcιν I sang . . ς. .
and they (the gods?) ι[ ]η for the child let win τα[.]
ων. [ ]. ηραμοι. . . . . [

62 καὶ Δίκην The reading of *P. Mich.* inv. 4967. *P. Oxy.* 1011 has]εμιν, for which Lobel supplied καὶ Θ]έμιν, which repeats καὶ θέμιν at the beginning of line 12.

63 Pfeiffer Add. et Corr. II 119. “καὶ Νόμου cέβας temptavit Bonner.” For the phrase ὑπτίῳ ποδί, he refers to Sophocles fr. 501.2 P. (*TrGF* 501).

64 τίμιον κ . . . . [. *P. Oxy.* 1011 has αἰνήcουc[ι . . . .] . . cτον κ . . . . [. Lobel conjectured κάλ]λιcτον κακόν, [fairest evil]; at fr. 384.15 *(The Victory of Sosibius)* gold is καλὸν κακὸν [fair evil]. *P. Mich.* inv. 4967 has καλλιcτ superscribed in a second hand, but τιμιον is not deleted.

74 ἥειcα Lobel reads a deleted or corrected letter after ἥειcα; Pfeiffer suggests ἥειcα[c] θεο[ῖc | οἱ δ’.

τ. . . . [ ]ι μιμειcθ̣. . [.]cον
τέξ[ο]μα̣ι[ ]. . . [.]. . .φ. ολοc
εἶκ’ ἄναξ ηπ[. . . . . οὐ]κ ἀλλοτρίη
ἀλλ̣ά̣ μοι μ̣η̣τ[. . . . .]ζει. . νοc
ὧν χάριν . . . πλ[. . . . .].τροφε
Κρήcιον κλ . . . . τεφ[. . . . .]αι πέρι
θη. . . . [.]. [. .]. . [. . . .]. [. . . .]α̣ι καλόν
χρὴ καλω[. . .]ωδε πρ. [.].θα. . . ιει .
τοῦτο̣ν. . [. . .]ιπτον [ο]ὐχ υ. . ρ. . [.]. ι
ὠγα̣θή̣, . οι̣ρ̣εων τιc ο[ὐ]χ ε. ωτιδ[

Diegesis to *Iambus* 12

IX

Ἄρτεμι Κρηταῖον Ἀμνίcου πέδον Τοῦ-
το γέγραπται εἰc ἕβδομα θυγατρίου
γεννηθέντοc Λέοντι γνωρίμῳ τοῦ
ποιητοῦ, ἐν ᾧ φηcιν διενεγκεῖν
τῶν †δεμυηθεντων τῇ Ἥβῃ ὑπὸ
τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν τὸν ἀ̣cθέντα ὑπὸ
τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνοc ὕμνον.

77 μιμειcθ̣. . [In my translation I am following Lobel's suggested μιμεῖcθα̣ι.

81–82 Barber (1955) 242 suggests for these lines ὧν χάριν κ̣α̣ὶ̣ πλ[εῖον, ὦ κουρ]ο̣τρόφε | Κρήcιον κλῖτ̣ο̣c̣ τε φ[οιτῶc]αι πέρι. I follow this reconstruction in my translation of these lines.

Dieg. 29 †δεμυηθεντων In the translation I follow Rostagni's suggestion δωρηθέντων cited by Pfeiffer; διυμνηθέντων suggested by Norsa and Vitelli (1934) cannot, it would seem, be right, as the gifts of the other gods are quite clearly fabricated objects, unless this phrase is understood metaphorically.

τ. . . . [ ]ι to imitate. . [.]cov
I will bring forth [ ]. . . [.]. . .φ. oλoc
the lord yielded ηπ[. . . . . not] of another's
but for me μ̣η̣τ[. . . . .]ζει. . νoc
for the sake of which [even more, you nurturer of children
and you (nymphs?) who wander] about the Cretan [slope]
θη. . . . [.]. [. .]. . [. . . .]. [. . . .]α̣ι a fair thing
must fairly? [. . .]ωδε πρ. [.].θα. . . ιει .
this. . [. . .]ιπτον not υ. . ρ. . [.]. ι
O gracious one, . οι̣ρ̣εων someone not ε. ωτιδ[

"Artemis who [frequents] the Cretan plain of Amnisus"
This was written for the seventh day
following the birth of a daughter of an acquaintance, Leon,
of the poet, in which he [the poet]
says that the hymn sung by Apollo
surpassed the (gifts given?) for Hebe
by the other gods.

Iambus 1 (fr. 191 Pf.) lines 32–77

The Parable of Bathycles' Cup

ἀνὴρ Βαθυκλῆ̣ς ’Αρκλάς—οὐ μακρὴν ἄξω,
ὦ λῷστε μὴ cλίμαιlνε, καὶ γὰρ οὐδ’ αὐτός
μ̣έγα cχολάζ[ω·] | δ[ε]ῖ | με γὰρ μέcον δινεῖν
φεῦ φε]ῦ ’Αχέρο[ντ]ος—τῶν πάλαι τις εὐδαίμων
ἐγένετο, πά[ν]τα δ’ εἶχεν οἷcιν ἄνθρωποι
θεοί τε λευκι̣ὰc ἡμέ̣ραc ἐπίcτανται.
ἤδη καθίκ[ειν οὗτ]ος ἡνίκ’ ἤμελλεν
ἐ̣ς̣ μακρὸν [. . . . .]—καὶ γὰρ ε̣. . . ο̣ς ἔζωcε—,
τῶν. . . . . [. . . .] τοὺc μὲν ἔνθα, τοὺc δ’ ἔνθα
ἔcτηcε τοῦ κλιντῆροc—εἶχε γὰρ δεcμ[ό]c—
μέλλονταc ἤδη παρθένοις ἀλινδεῖcθαι.
μόλις δ’ ἐπά[ραc] ὡς πότης ἐπ’ ἀγκῶνα
. .]. . . ν ὁ̣ ’Α̣ρκ[ὰc κ]ἀνὰ τὴν cτέγην βλέψαc
.]. . .ν̣οις. [. . .]. . [
ἔ]πειτ’ ἔφ[ηcε
'ὦ π̣αῖδες ὦ̣ι ἐμαὶ τὠπιόντος ἄγκυραι
. .]. . .λο. . [
β]ούλεcθε ῥ̣έξω[
c]ὺ̣ν θεοῖcι καὶ. [.
. . . .]. . [

[about 15 lines are missing]

. . . . . .

ι̣ἔπλευcεν ἐc Μίλητον· ἦν γὰρ ἡ νίκη
Θάλητος, ὅς τ’ ἦν ἄλλα δεξιὸς γνώμην̣
καὶ τῆς ’Αμάξης ἐλέγετο cταθμήcαcθαι
τοὺc ἀcτερίcκους, ᾗ πλέουcι Φοίνικες.

37 λευκι̣ὰc ἡμέ̣ραc This phrase has an apparent parallel at Hipponax fr. 47.1 W. (51.1 Deg.) παρ’ ὦι σὺ λευκόπεπλον ἡμέρην μείνας. See Ardizzoni (1960)8, D’Alessio (1996) 582 n.18. Were this even a partial allusion to one or more verses of Hipponax, there would be thus a second contextual bridge between the narrative frame and the fable here (two journeys across Acheron, two figures marked by Hipponactean allusion). The *Scholia Florentina* to this line note this phrase, but the comment has not survived. Vox (1995) 280 suggests that in casting the λευκαὶ

Bathycles, a man of Arcadia—I will not draw on at length,
good man, do not turn up your nose, for truly even I have not
much time. For alas, alas I must whirl
in the midst of Acheron—was one of the blessed of old
and he had everything with which men
and gods know joyful days.
And when he was about to come to the long [journey]
—for indeed he had lived (virtuously?)—
of his (sons) he placed some here,
some there about his couch—a bond constrained them—
already about to roll about with girls.
With difficulty raising himself on his elbow, as at a banquet,
.]. . . ν the Arcadian looking up along the ceiling
.]. . . ν̣οιc. [. . .]. . [
then he said
"My children, my anchors as I go out
.]. . .λο. . [
you want I will do[
and with the gods. [.
. . . .]. . [

[about 15 lines are missing]

. . . . . .

he sailed to Miletus. For the victory fell to Thales
who was of able mind in other things,
and who was said to have measured out the little stars
of the Wagon, by which the Phoenicians sail.

ἡμέραι as a parallel experience of gods and men Callimachus may be subtly responding to theology of Euhemerus, and even punning on his name.

41 εἶχε γὰρ δεcμ[ό]c The sense of this line is extremely problematic. Assuming this to be the correct reading, Bathycles' sons are in some way constrained, perhaps by their father or by the occasion of his deathbed?

42 ἀλινδεῖcθαι Degani (1995) 114 sees this use of traditional iambic obscenity as a Callimachean σφραγίς, as κύcῳ at line 98; the term also occurs at Herodas 5.30.

εὗρεν δ' ὁ Προυcέληνο[c] ᾳ̣ὶcίῳ cίττῃ
ἐν τοῦ Δ̣ιδυμέοc τὸν γέρ[ο]ντα κωνῄῳ
ξύοντα τὴν γῆν καὶ γράφοντα τὸ cχῆμα,
τοὐξεῦρ' ὁ Φρὺξ Εὔφορβιοc̣, ὅcτιc ἀνθρώπων
τριίγ̣ωνα καὶ cκιαληνὰ̣ πρῶτοc ἔγριαψ̣ε
καὶ κύκλον ἐπ[. . .]ικ̣ὴδίδαξε νηcτεύειν
τῶν ἐμπνεόιντων· οἰ̣ι̣ ι̣'Ιταλοὶ δ' ὑπήκουcαν,
οὐ πάντεc, ἀλλ' οὓc εἶχεν ι̣οὔτεροc δαίμων.
πρὸc δή [μ]ιν ὧδ' ἔφηcε. [
ἐκεῖ[νο] τοὐλόχρυcον ἐξ[ελὼν πήρηc·
'οὑμὸc πατὴρ ἐφεῖτο τοῦ̣[το τοὔκπωμα
δοῦ̣[ναι], τίc ὑμέων τῶν cοφ[ῶν ὀνήιcτοc
τῶν ἑπτά· κ̣ὴγὼ cοὶ δίδωμ[ι πρωτῆ̣ον.'
ἔτυψε δὲ] cκίπωνι τοὔδα[φοc πρέcβυc
καὶ τ]ὴν ὑπήνην τ̣ὴτέρῃ [καταψήχων
ἐξεῖπ̣[ε·] 'τ̣ὴν δ̣ό̣cιν μὲν [
cὺ δ' εἰ̣ [το]κ̣εῶνοc μ̣ὴ λό[γοιc ἀπειθήcειc,
Βίηc [. . . . . ·.]ε̣ι̣λ̣[

[about 20 lines are missing: four are known from elsewhere]

. . . . . .

Cόλων· ἐκεῖνοc δ' ὡc Χίλων' ἀπέcτειλεν

. . . . . .

πάλιν τὸ δῶρον ἐc Θάλητ' ἀνώλιcθεν

. . . . . .

'Θάληc με τῷ μεδεῦντι Νείλεω δήμου
δίδωcι, τοῦτο δὶc λαβὼν ἀριcτῆ̣ον.'

60 τριίγ̣ωνα Vox (1995) 284–85 draws a parallel with *Aetia* fr. 114.2–3 πολυγώνιε, χαῖρε[| πα]ιδὸc ἐπὶ προθύροιc. [hail, Polygonal one[, of a child before the door]. On the shape of the Apollo venerated at Didyma see G. B. D'Alessio, "Apollo Delio, i Cabiri Milesii e le Cavalle di Tracia. Osservazioni su Callimaco frr. 114–155 Pf.," *ZPE* 106 (1995): 5–21.

And the Arcadian by happy chance found the old man
in the shrine of Apollo at Didyma
scratching the ground with a staff, and drawing the figure
that the Phrygian Euphorbus discovered,
who first of men drew unequal triangles and the circle,
and who taught men to abstain from living creatures.
The Italians obeyed him, not all,
but those whom the other spirit constrained.
To him he spoke thus. [
having taken that golden goblet from his satchel.
"My father enjoined me to bestow this cup
on the one of you seven wise men who is best;
and I give first prize to you."
The old man struck the ground with his stick,
and scratching his beard with his other hand, said
"The gift[
but if you will not disobey his words,
Bias [. . . . . .]ει̣λ̣[

[about 20 lines are missing: four are known from elsewhere]

. . . . . .

Solon. But he sent it to Chilon

. . . . . .

and again the gift returned to Thales

. . . . . .

"Thales, having received this prize twice,
grants me to him who protects the people of Neleus."

Diegesis to *Iambus* 1

VI

1 ’Ακούcαθ’ ‘Ιππώνακτοc· οὐ γὰρ ἀλλ’ ἥκω
‘Υποτίθεται φθιτὸν ‘Ιππώνακτα cυγκαλοῦν-
τα τοὺc φιλολόγουc εἰc τὸ Παρ-
μενίωνοc καλούμενον Caραπίδειον· ἥκου-
5 cι δ’ αὐτοῖc κατ’ εἴλαc ἀπαγορεύει φθονεῖν
ἀλλήλοιc, λέγων ὡc Βαθυκλῆc ’Αρκὰc τελευ-
τῶν τήν τε ἄλλην οὐcίαν διέθετο καὶ δὴ
χρυcοῦν ἔκπωμα τῷ μέcῳ τῶν υἱῶν
’Αμφάλκῃ ἐνεχείριcεν, ὅπωc δῷ τῷ ἀρίcτῳ
10 τῶν ἑπτὰ cοφῶν. ὁ δὲ ἐλθὼν εἰc Μίλητον
ἐδίδου τοῦτο Θάλητι ὡc διαφέρ[ο]ντι τῶν ἄλλων,
ὁ δὲ ἀπέπεμψε πρὸc Βίαντα τὸν Πριηνέα, ὁ
δὲ πρὸc Περίανδρον τὸν Κορίνθιον, ὁ δὲ ὡc Cό-
λωνα τὸν ’Αθηναῖον, ὁ [δ]ὲ πρὸ[c] Χίλωνα τὸν
15 Λ[α]κεδαι[μό]νιον, ὁ δὲ πρὸc Π[ιτ]τακὸν τὸν Μι-
τυλη[ναῖον, ὁ δ]ὲ πρὸc [Κ]λεύ[βο]υλ[ο]ν τὸν Λί[ν-
δι̣[ο]ν.[τὸ δὲ ἔκπωμα] ὑπὸ τούτου [π]εμφθὲν [ἦλ-
θε πάλιν εἰc Θάλητα· ὁ] δὲ ἀνατίθη[cι] τῷ [Δ]ιδυμ[εῖ
’Α]πόλ[λωνι δὶc λαβ]ὼν ἀριcτε[ῖο]ν. τοιγαρ[οῦν
20 ἔφη. [. . . . .]αιο.[. . . . .] ἀλλήλων
κρ.τ[. . . . .]ι̣ο̣ι̣c̣τ̣[. . . . . ἐ]ρίζεcθε.

"Listen to Hipponax. For indeed I have come"
He imagines the dead Hipponax summoning together
the *philologoi* to the temple of Sarapis
called that of Parmenio. When they come
in swarms he enjoins them not to envy one another,
telling how the Arcadian Bathycles
in dying bequeathed the rest of his wealth
and handed a gold cup to Amphalces, his middle son,
that he give it to the best of the seven wise men.
And he, going to Miletus, gave it to Thales,
as he was superior to the rest,
but he sent it away to Bias of Priene, and he to
Periander of Corinth, and he to
Solon the Athenian, and he to Chilon
the Lacedaemonian, and he to Pittacus
of Mytilene, and he to Cleobulus
the Lindian. The cup sent by this one
came back to Thales. And he receiving it twice
as an award dedicated it to Apollo at Didyma. Wherefore
he said [. . . . .]αιο.[. . . . .] of one another
κρ.τ[. . . . .]ιοιc̣τ̣[. . . . .] you quarrel.

Interpretation

Iambus 12

OCCASION

The diegete identifies *Iambus* 12 as a poem composed for the seventh-day fête of the daughter of one of the poet's friends. The poem, itself the gift of the singer, has as its center a narrative of a contest among the gods for the finest gift for the child-god Hebe. The finest and most lasting present is Apollo's gift of song. The Chinese box structure of the poem is remarkable. Apollo sings within the narrative of the gods' contest within the larger narrative of the poem; song within song within song. The paradigm of Apollo's gift, while in many respects depicted with considerable humor, serves, nonetheless, to solemnize the poet's own act of giving, and to underline with the divine parallel the quality of the poet's talent. As elsewhere in the *Iambi* the lines that immediately surround the paradigm have a certain fluid, permeable quality that allows the parallel of paradigm and surrounding narrative context to be the more closely drawn.

The Diegesis gives the occasion of the poem's composition and the name of the poet's friend. The little girl appears as a figure in the remaining lines of the poem but her father does not. The occasion (εἰc ἕβδομα θυγατρίου | γεννηθέντοc, [for the seventh day following the birth of a daughter]) is probably the *Amphidromia* or the rite of name-giving (these ceremonies could apparently be combined as one).[1] *Iambus* 12 is a unique example of a birthday poem from the Hellenistic period, although it has long been assumed that such poems must have existed.[2]

1. See Dawson (1950) 117–20, Walter Burkert, *Greek Religion* (Cambridge, Mass., 1985), 255, 446–47 nn.

2. One epigram of Callimachus himself may be worth comparing here, a prayer for a woman's easy delivery composed in the manner of a votive offering (Callim. *Ep.* 53 Pf. = 23 G.-P.):

> καὶ πάλιν, Εἰλείθυια, Λυκαινίδοc ἐλθὲ καλεύcηc
> εὔλοχοc ὠδίνων ὧδε cὺν εὐτοκίῃ,
> ὡc τόδε νῦν μέν, ἄναcca, κόρηc ὕπερ, ἀντὶ δὲ παιδόc
> ὕcτερον εὐώδηc ἄλλο τι νηὸc ἔχοι.
>
> Once again come, Eileithyia, helper in childbirth,
> when Lykaenis calls, so with easy delivery from her pains,
> so may your fragrant temple have this now, lady, on behalf of a girl,
> and later something else in exchange for a boy.

On this epigram see Gutzwiller (1998) 190–92.

Birthday poems occur in epigram form in Greek literature especially of a later era, and are of course known in Latin poetry.[3] Qua birthday poem, *Iambus* 12 has perplexed scholars. Some have attempted to read it as an example of the genre suggested by Athenaeus 4.176d ἀείδειν . . . τὰ γενέθλια [to sing of the birth]. Lacking parallels in poetry, these scholars have drawn on the rhetorical precepts laid out for a λόγος γενεθλιακός [birthday speech] in Menander Rhetor (2 [8]) and pseudo-Dionysus (iii), and found *Iambus* 12 in many respects lacking. The fault here may well lie with the interpretive approach, not the poem. Such an approach, as that of tying *Iambus* 6 to the rhetorical conventions of *propemptika* [speeches of escort], is to attribute to Callimachus too narrow an understanding of genre. Indeed, this goes against the very nature of the *Iambi* as a collection, where genre is clearly malleable to refashioning.[4]

The diegete identifies the poet's acquaintance as one Leon; we do not know whether this man's name in fact occurred in the poem itself. The uncertainty of the Diegesis in naming the addressee of *Iambus* 5 may suggest a cautionary note here. The prevalence of Cretan imagery in the poem, however, may well indicate that the child was born there.[5] Callimachus' poetry of children often highlights the place of their birth, at once showcasing his knowledge of topographical detail and at the same time evoking the quality of physical and temporal distance, or displacement, which characterizes much of his composition.[6] Crete and Cretan imagery have a prominent role in Callimachus' poetry, which may in part reflect Ptolemaic interests in Crete (a major source of mercenary troops) and the eastern Mediterranean.

The Cretan details in the poem's opening and (as we have it) closing lines are many. Amnisus (line 1 'Αμνισοῦ πέδον) is especially associated with the cult of Artemis-Eileithyia,[7] line 2 ἥ τε Δικτ̣[is clearly a reference to Mt. Dicte in Crete. The association of Artemis with the birthday fête of a little girl is to be expected. Amnisus also plays a prominent role in Callimachus' *Hymn to Artemis* (3) in two passages that evoke the goddess' hunting, lines 15–17 and 162–65. The close association of Artemis and Apollo in *Iambus* 12 is reflected in the intertextual allusions to the hymns to Artemis and to Delos. At lines 15–17 the poet evokes another of his hymns, the *Hymn to Zeus* (1), and another divine birth.

3. See K. Argetsinger, "Birthday Rituals: Friends and Patrons in Roman Poetry and Cult," *CA* 11, 2 (1992): 175–93.

4. Which is not to say that the diegete may not have a narrow sense of genre; it seems likely in several instances that he is attempting loosely to classify these poems.

5. I owe this observation to E. Courtney.

6. See Selden (1998) 307–19.

7. Pfeiffer comm.

ἔcτιν οικ[. . .]. ι. . . ἀψευδέα λέγων
καὶ τάφο[ν τὸ]ν Κ[ρ]ῆτα γινώcκειν κενόν
φηcὶ καὶ πατρῷ̣[ο]ν̣ οὐ κτείνει Δία·
Callim. *Iambus* 12.15–17

there is οικ[. . .]. ι. . . saying things which are not false
and says he knows the Cretan grave is empty
and does not kill the Zeus of his fathers.

'Κρῆτεc ἀεὶ ψεῦcται'· καὶ γὰρ τάφον, ὦ ἄνα, cεῖο
Κρῆτεc ἐτεκτήναντο· cὺ δ' οὐ θάνεc, ἐccὶ γὰρ αἰεί.
Callim. *Hy.* 1.8–9[8]

"Cretans always lie." For the Cretans even built a tomb,
Lord, for you. But you did not die, for you are eternal.

The verbal parallels between these two passages (Κ[ρ]ῆτα . . . Κρῆτεc, ἀψευδέα . . . ἀεὶ ψεῦcται, τάφον, ὦ ἄνα, cεῖο . . . τάφο[ν . . . κενόν) are remarkable, as are the repetition of sound in ἀψευδέα...ἀεὶ ψεῦcται, with, however, opposite sense, and the delayed attribute of τάφον in both passages. The intertextual parallel is the more attractive given the contextual similarity of *Hymn* 1 and *Iambus* 12. Both poems narrate events centering on the early childhood of Olympians, and both are in fact addresses to parallel individuals, the one to Ptolemy Philadelphus, the other to an associate of the poet.

In considering the occasion and composition of Callimachus' *Iambus* 12 several of his hymns are helpful. They engage us on two planes that prove illuminating. The first is a poetic tradition celebrating the births of gods. An important model is the Homeric *Hymn to Hermes,* a poem that finds a wide variety of resonance in the literature of Ptolemaic Alexandria. In this hymn Apollo plays a central role, as does the gift of song (here given to Apollo rather than by him). Callimachus recasts the elements Apollo, gift, and song to his own purpose in *Iambus* 12, a poem that also reflects the use of craft in fashioning song. The influence of the Homeric hymns on Callimachus is strongly marked in his three hymns that celebrate child-gods (1, 3, and 4). *Hymns* 1 and 4 celebrate the birth of a deity, and 3 is concerned with gift-giving, here the powers given by Zeus to the child Artemis. Callimachus' *Hymn to Zeus* (1), close in many respects to the Homeric *Hymn to Hermes,* appears itself to be recalled by, or to share several striking parallels with, *Iambus* 12.

There is another factor, a contemporary Alexandrian one, which underlies the composition of *Iambus* 12—a developing interest in

8. On these lines see L. Roussel (1929) 19–20.

Ptolemaic court poetry in drawing parallels between the mortal and divine planes, and deliberately obscuring the borders between the two. So in Callim. fr. 110 Pf. the erotic lament of the catasterized πλόκαμος parallels the grief of Berenice II on the departure of her husband to the wars in Syria; here the addressee is also a very young woman. So the ἱερὸς γάμος [holy union] of Zeus and Hera (and of Isis and Osiris) parallels, indeed valorizes, the love of Ptolemy II and his sister Arsinoe II in Theocr. *Idyll* 17. And in the same way the journey of the deified Philotera through the heavens at once parallels and prefigures the journey of the dead Arsinoe II in Callim. fr. 228. The work that is especially intriguing here is Callimachus' *Hymn to Delos* (4) where the birth of the god Apollo serves as divine occasion for an extended celebratory passage on the birth of Ptolemy II (lines 162–88).[9] The *Hymn to Delos* has a reversed if similar structure to *Iambus* 12. The prophecy of the birth of Ptolemy II in *Hymn* 4 is enclosed within a poem which celebrates the birth of Apollo; in *Iambus* 12 the celebration of the birthday of Hebe is enclosed within a frame celebrating the birthday of a mortal girl. In both compositions the effect is the same—an "immortalizing," as it were, of the human event through the divine one.

The prominent role of children, whether divine or mortal, as central figures in the poetry of Callimachus has received relatively little attention in Callimachean scholarship. His poetry is remarkable for a detailed, sympathetic portrayal of children and childhood and for his occasional self-representation as a child. Certainly some figures, such as the *eromenoi* [beloveds] of *Iambus* 3 and the erotic epigrams (who are arguably not children as such), have parallels in earlier Greek poetry, as do some representations of child-gods (e.g. the baby Hermes of the Homeric hymn). There remain, however, a remarkable number of child subjects and references to the childhoods of subjects, among others the little girl of *Iambus* 12, the figure of the young Berenice II Euergetes in the *Lock of Berenice* (fr. 110 Pf.),[10] again in the *Victory of*

9. On these lines see Bing (1988) 128–139, Koenen (1982) 174–90, S. A. Stephens, *Seeing Double: The Politics of Poetry in Ptolemaic Alexandria* (Berkeley, 2003), ch. 3.

10. See Catullus 66.25–28 (these lines of the Callimachean version do not survive):

> *at <te> ego certe*
> *cognoram a parva virgine magnanimam.*
> *anne bonum oblita es facinus, quo regium adepta es*
> *coniugium, quod non fortior ausit alis?*

and Callim. fr. 110.77–78:

> ἧc ἄπο, παρ[θ]ενίη μὲν ὅτ' ἦν ἔτι, πολλιὰ πέ⌊πωκα
> λιιτ⌊ά, γυναικείων δ' οὐκ ἀπέλαυcα μύρων.

Berenice (*SH* frr. 254–68C),[11] the girl Selenaia of *Ep.* 5 (14 G.-P.); the portrayal of Acontius and Cydippe (frr. 67–75) and of their in many ways child-like love for one another falls within this category. I do not mean to imply here that Callimachus and his fellow Alexandrian poets "invented" the careful portrayal of childhood, or a "realism" of childhood. There are several instances of detailed portrayals of children and characterizations of childhood in fifth-century tragedy (e.g. the baby Orestes in the *Choephoroi* of Aeschylus, Hecuba's address to the dead Astyanax in Euripides' *Troades*) and in epic (the fear of Astyanax of the plume of Hector's helmet at the conclusion of *Iliad* 6, the image of Phoenix and the baby Achilles in *Iliad* 9). Rather the Hellenistic poets here, as in many other instances, whether heroic, pathetic, or humorous, make use of already existing features of an earlier tradition, or potentialities existent in an earlier tradition, but with novel emphases, tone, and elaboration.[12]

In *Iambus* 12 the childhood of the addressee serves as a twofold artistic conceit. The girl's birth allows the introduction of a paradigm of a divine childhood, and the family ritual serves as a vehicle for the introduction of a gathering of deities and hence of the narrative structure surrounding the paradigm of Apollo's victorious creation, his gift of song.

At the center of the poem is a divine assembly gathered to celebrate Hebe's birth, a birthday celebration that mirrors the mortal one, which in turn has occasioned this poem. The gods gather at Hera's invitation to compete in gift-giving. The description of an assembly of the gods on a festive occasion has a long tradition in earlier Greek poetry and myth; the weddings of Peleus and Thetis and of Cadmus and Harmony are part of this tradition. At these two occasions Apollo is also the singer, or the singer together with the Muses.[13] Nonnus' description of the gift-bearing gods at *Dion.* 5.571 is similar in some respects to that of Callimachus *Iambus* 12, and may in fact owe something

11. *P. Lille* 82.1a = *SH* 254.2:

νύμφα, κα[cιγνή]των ἱερὸν αἷμα θεῶν

12. So e.g. although the visit of Theseus to Hecale in Callimachus' *Hecale* may have been in part suggested by episodes with Odysseus and Eurycleia, or Odysseus and Eumaeus, the emphasis on certain details of the domestic arrangements, the tone, etc. are not Homeric. So too in the poem *Heracles the Lionslayer* sometimes attributed to Theocritus ([Theocr.] *Idyll* 25) the poem develops a theme taken from epic, the narration of a battle, in a novel context and with novel emphasis on the everyday rusticity of this context.

13. Cf. Pindar fr. 32 S.-M., *Theogn.* 15–16 (Cadmus and Harmony); *Il.* 24.55–63, Menander Rhetor 2[6] *The Epithalamium* (Peleus and Thetis).

to the earlier work. The arrival of the deities in Catullus 64 is another later passage that invites comparison with this part of *Iambus* 12.

The portrayal of the divine assembly in *Iambus* 12 is on two levels strikingly original. (1) Callimachus has created with great care a divine parallel to the human situation of gift-giving, with the gods, particularly Athena, Hephaestus, and Apollo, in fact characterized as artists. Further the repeated allusions to youthful episodes in the lives of the divinities, Athena's bathing in the waters of Triton, the kidnapping of Persephone, Apollo's slaying of the Pytho, all emphasize the youth of the addressee, the little girl whose celebration has occasioned the poem. (2) As he does elsewhere in his poetry Callimachus makes his divine source of inspiration his spokesman, and uses the occasion of Hebe's birth to enunciate the traditional, particularly Pindaric, encomium of song. In the confluence of these two aspects *Iambus* 12 is emblematic of Alexandrian poetic aesthetics: the grand is made human, and the role of the smaller, here a child's gift, is highlighted and elevated.

We have in *Iambus* 12 a poem in which there are two singers, the mortal poet and the god Apollo, two gifts of song, two small girls as addressees, and two paradigms. Apollo's victory as singer serves as the paradigm for the larger poem; the eternal life of song and the ephemeral, often sinful, acquisition of gold, are exempla for the interior narrative of the divine contest. There is a *tour de force* in the positioning of these exempla. For while Callimachus employs a divine exemplum to valorize his choice of gift, the singer Apollo delineates one that is the cause of human corruption. There is even a quality of this contrapositioning in the parallel introductions of the god. For whereas the narrator of this divine tale introduces Apollo not only with epic attributes and possessions, but with a characteristically heightened verb of speech (line 53 ἐφ[θέγ]ξω, [you uttered]), Apollo addresses himself with reference to the same poetic terms which are the hallmarks of his own advice to Callimachus in the *Aetia* prologue—the confluence of identities of the two singers is drawn closely indeed.

THE GATHERING OF DEITIES

The poet, having prayed to the Μοῖραι, the Fates, to hear him propitiously (lines 18–19), turns with the declarative ἀείσομαι at the end of line 19 to his paradigm, the gifts given by several deities at the seventh-day fête of Hebe, and the supremacy of Apollo's gift of song. The narrative takes up most of the poem; the poet appears to close it in the

same declarative tone at line 74 ἤεισα,[14] bounding invention of song within an act of singing. This paradigm is essentially in two parts: the assembly of the gods and the portrayal of their contest (lines 20–46); and the introduction of Apollo and his soliloquy (line 47 to about line 73). *P. Mich.* inv. 4967 greatly aids us in providing much of the text of Apollo's speech from lines 57–70, and in discussing those lines we are now textually on very secure ground.[15] A careful reading, however, of lines 20–46 together with a judicious use of literary parallels can provide a great deal more of the structure and nature of this earlier part of the paradigm. It becomes clear that this assembly of divinities, one of a traditional line of assemblies of gods at festive occasions, is carefully structured by Callimachus both with deliberate pairing of divine figures,[16] and, strikingly, through allusions to divine childhood which reflect the paradigmatic occasion and the birthday of the addressee.

Artemis / Apollo

The first pair are the two immortals whom the poet addresses directly, the brother-sister gods Artemis and Apollo (line 1 Ἄρτεμι, line 47 Δ]ήλι' ὤπολλον, cύ, line 79 ἄναξ, prob. line 81]. τροφε, line 86 ὠγαθή). Callimachus begins *Iambus* 12 with an apostrophe of Cretan Artemis, and appears at the end to return to the same theme. The final lines are very fragmentary, but Κρήcιον at 82 is certain. The central divine figure of the poem is Apollo. This pairing is itself not surprising, but the prominence of Apollo and Artemis throughout the poetry of Callimachus is remarkable, and this pairing transcends metrical / generic boundaries. Although Artemis is not in fact apparently one of the gods

14. An exact division of speakers in the last extant lines of the poem must remain partly conjectural. Pfeiffer assumes in his commentary that the Olympian paradigm concludes with line 75, which must be correct. τέξ[ο]μαι line 78 is a verb Callimachus uses elsewhere of his own composition, ἄναξ at 79 is the address the poet uses for Apollo on other occasions (cf. *Iambus* 3.1). I believe the repetition of the verb ἀείδω in the first person singular gives a further clue, if ἤεισα is the correct reading; for it is the poet of *Iambus* 12 who is the singer of this tale of a divine assembly and of Apollo's gift of song. If, as Pfeiffer suggests, we read ἤεισα[c], with Apollo as subject, the framing effect of the verb would still be the same, returning to the poem's occasional setting. Cf., however, also Dieg. IX 30 ἀcθέντα, where the singer is Apollo. The diegete by contrast refers to the poem of Callimachus as written γέγραπται; the language of the diegete need not reflect the compositional imagery of the poem.

15. First published by C. Bonner, "A New Fragment of Callimachus (Iamb. XII, 57–70)," *Aegyptus* 31 (1951): 133–37. *P. Mich.* inv. 4967 is given as 4947 in Pfeiffer.

16. In my work on the structure of this section of *Iambus* 12.I was originally inspired by A. W. Bulloch's textual notes on the attribution of line-groups to various figures; this first suggested to me that there might be a pattern in the grouping of divine figures.

providing gifts, it is she whom the poet addresses in the hymnic opening line. The contrast of this hymnic address and the somewhat playful presentation of the poet-god Apollo is emblematic of the varying levels of tone in the poem as a whole.

Hera / Zeus

The first two deities mentioned in the actual context of the celebration are Hera and Zeus (20–26); Hera as the host (21–22), and Zeus as the first of the gift-givers. For line 26 Ζεὺc πατὴρ οὐ φαυ. . . . [. . . . .] . . [Barber[17] suggests Ζεὺc πατὴρ οὐ φαῦλον ὤπαcεν τέλοc / κράτοc in part following the description of Zeus' gifts at Non. *Dion.* 5.127 (a passage which clearly recalls *Iambus* 12) as πάντα τέλεια. The short phrase πάντα τέλεια is suggestive; it encapsulates perfection, though briefly. Barber's suggestion for this line of *Iambus* 12 is attractive as it carries a similar ironic quality. The poet's comment on the gifts of Zeus is the shortest and least detailed of his descriptions, although not therefore dismissive. The brevity of the description may rather be somewhat tongue-in-cheek. We recall from Callimachus' *Hymn to Zeus* that (1) Callimachus employs the *topos* that Zeus always be named first,[18] (2) that

17. Barber, cited by Dawson (1950) 110, n. 26.
18.

> Ζηνὸc ἔοι τί κεν ἄλλο παρὰ cπονδῇcιν ἀείδειν
> λώϊον ἢ θεὸν αὐτόν, ἀεὶ μέγαν, αἰὲν ἄνακτα,
> Πηλαγόνων ἐλατῆρα, δικαcπόλον Οὐρανίδηcι;
>
> Callim. *Hy.* 1.1–3
>
> What else could be a better subject of song at libations to Zeus
> than the god himself, ever great, ever lord,
> router of the Pelasgians, justice giver to the sons of Heaven?
>
> Ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχώμεσθα καὶ ἐς Δία λήγετε Μοῖσαι,
> ἀθανάτων τὸν ἄριστον, ἐπὴν †ἀείδωμεν ἀοιδαῖς·
>
> Theocr. *Id.* 17.1–2
>
> With Zeus let us begin, and with Zeus, Muses, cease,
> best of the immortals, when we sing in song.
>
> Ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχώμεσθα, τὸν οὐδέποτ' ἄνδρες ἐῶμεν
> ἄρρητον· μεσταὶ δὲ Διὸς πᾶσαι μὲν ἀγυιαί,
> πᾶσαι δ' ἀνθρώπων ἀγοραί, μεστὴ δὲ θάλασσα
> καὶ λιμένες· πάντη δὲ Διὸς κεχρήμεθα πάντες.
>
> Aratus *Phaenom.* 1–4
>
> Let us begin with Zeus, whom we men never leave
> unspoken. For all streets are filled with Zeus,
> and all the places of mens' assembly, and the sea is filled with him
> and the harbors. We all in all things have need of Zeus.

the works of Zeus are so overwhelming that they cannot be named,[19] and (3) that the stature of Zeus is above contesting.[20] I would suggest that the brevity of the poet's remarks on Zeus' gifts is not dismissive; rather Zeus appears first in place of honor, and the poet then sets his gifts aside. He, the father of Hebe, is not one of the contesting gods. Crucial to this suggestion is the fact that Apollo in his soliloquy mentions Hephaestus (line 57) and Athena (line 65) as contestants vying with him—these two are, in reverse order, the first and last gift-givers the poet describes in detail. Apollo, in other words, does not claim that his gift will surpass that of Zeus.

Most commentators have taken τῇ μικκῇ [for the little girl] at line 20 to refer to the child named in the Diegesis θυγατρίου | γεννηθέντος Λέοντι γνωρίμῳ τοῦ | ποιητοῦ [the birth of a daughter of an acquaintance,

19.

χαῖρε μέγα, Κρονίδη πανυπέρτατε, δῶτορ ἐάων,
δῶτορ ἀπημονίης. τεὰ δ' ἔργματα τίς κεν ἀείδοι;
οὐ γένετ', οὐκ ἔσται· τίς κεν Διὸς ἔργματ' ἀείσει;

Callim. *Hy.* 1.91–93

Hail greatly, most excellent son of Cronus, giver of good things,
giver of safety. Who could sing of your works?
There has been no one, nor will be. Who could sing of the works of
Zeus?

20.

ἀλλ' ἔτι παιδνὸς ἐὼν ἐφράσσαο πάντα τέλεια·
τῷ τοι καὶ γνωτοὶ προτερηγενέες περ ἐόντες
οὐρανὸν οὐκ ἐμέγηραν ἔχειν ἐπιδαίσιον οἶκον.
δηναιοὶ δ' οὐ πάμπαν ἀληθέες ἦσαν ἀοιδοί·
φάντο πάλον Κρονίδησι διάτριχα δώματα νεῖμαι·
τίς δέ κ' ἐπ' Οὐλύμπῳ τε καὶ Ἄϊδι κλῆρον ἐρύσσαι,
ὃς μάλα μὴ νενίηλος; ἐπ' ἰσαίῃ γὰρ ἔοικε
πήλασθαι· τὰ δὲ τόσσον ὅσον διὰ πλεῖστον ἔχουσι.
ψευδοίμην, ἀίοντος ἅ κεν πεπίθοιεν ἀκουήν.
οὔ σε θεῶν ἐσσῆνα πάλοι θέσαν, ἔργα δὲ χειρῶν,
σή τε βίη τό τε κάρτος, ὃ καὶ πέλας εἵσαο δίφρου.

Callim. *Hy.* 1.57–67

But while still a child you contrived all things perfectly.
And for this reason your kinsmen, though they were older,
did not begrudge your holding heaven as your appointed home.
The poets of long ago were not completely truthful.
They said a lot cast threeways apportioned their homes to Cronus' sons.
But who would draw lots for Olympus and for Hades,
who was not very foolish? For it is fitting that lots be cast
for equal things. These are as far apart as possible.
May I tell fiction, which would persuade the listener's ear.
Lots did not make you sovereign of the gods, but the works of your hands,
your force and your strength, which you have set near your throne.

Leon]. The presence of this child in the poem is one detail of the earlier part of the diegete's summary that the parallel figure of Hebe would seem to assure. τῇ μικκῇ at line 20 may also designate the child Hebe. I suggest that Callimachus here creates a deliberate fluidity or permeability in the contextual frame of the paradigm; this allows for a closer association of the figure of the paradigm with the figure of the preceding narrative. π[αι]δί at line 75 illustrates the same feature; at whatever point in these lines the paradigm concludes, this word can refer to either Hebe or the daughter of Leon. In this way the parallel of Apollo singing for Hebe and Callimachus singing for his friend's child is more tightly drawn. μικκός appears elsewhere in Callimachus in a partly programmatic context (*SH* 253.11 = fr. 475 Pf. αἰεὶ τοῖς μικκοῖς μικκὰ διδοῦσι θεοί);[21] the sense of the adjective here may be equally doubly determined, designating its subject both as physical being and poetic material.

Athena / Poseidon

The second pair of gods in the description of this assembly are Athena and Poseidon (lines 27–30), a pair familiar as agonistic rivals in giving gifts, for example, from the mythological adoption of a patron god by Athens. The characterization of Athena and of her gifts merits detailed attention for an appreciation of the whole of this scene of assembly. Callimachus introduces Athena as the "Tritonian," or "Tritonian maid" (Τριτωνίς . . . κόρ[η]), if we follow Hunt's reading. For the epithet "Tritonian" we have literary parallels in a dedicatory epigram of Antipater of Sidon,[22] as well as from Callimachus himself in the first book of the *Aetia* (fr. 37 Pf.).[23] Apollonius of Rhodes gives the connection of the Tri-

21. See *S.H.* comm. ad loc., Cameron (1995) 139.

22.

ἁ πάρος αἱματόεν πολέμου μέλος ἐν δαὶ σάλπιγξ
καὶ γλυκὺν εἰράνας ἐκπροχέουσα νόμον
ἄγκειμαι, Φερένικε, τεὸν Τριτωνίδι κούρᾳ
δῶρον, ἐριβρύχων παυσαμένα κελάδων.

Ant. Sid. *A.P.* 6.159 (3 G.-P.)

I, the trumpet who before poured forth the bloody song of war in battle
and the sweet measure of peace
am dedicated, Pherenicus, your gift, to the Tritonian girl
having ceased from loud-resonating sounds.

23.

ἰοΐη τε Τρίτωνος ἐφ' ὕδασιν Ἀσβύσταο
Ἡφαίστου λόχιον θηξ[α]μένου πέλεκυν

tonian waters of Libya (Cyrene) and Athena at *Argonautica* 4.1308–11:[24] it was here that Athena was first bathed after her birth.

The choice of this epithet in the context of *Iambus* 12 has a twofold significance. "Tritonian" is an oblique reference to Cyrene, a frequent and important feature of Callimachus' poetry. The episode of the Tritonian waters is, further, one from the first days of Athena. Several of the episodes concerning the gods whom these lines evoke are concerned with divine childhood, reflecting the childhood of the recipients of both songs, Hebe and the daughter of the poet's friend.

Athena is the first of the divinites in this gathering cast as an artisan, and as an artisan in Callimachean terms (line 27 τ̣ε̣χνήεντα ποικ[ίλ]α [artful and variously wrought]). Barber's conjecture at line 27 γλ[υφῇ is, as Gould noted, especially attractive, as Athena's gifts would then be done in relief. This conjecture finds some support in the characterization of these gifts at line 66 καίπερ εὖ cμίλη̣cιν ἠ|κ̣ρι-β̣ωμένην. Both the verb γλυφάω and the image of Athena as chiseler appear in the fourth *Mime* of Herodas at lines 57–59:

οὐχ ὁρῇς, φίλη Κυννοῖ;
οἷ' ἔργα κεῖν'—ἦν, ταῦτ' ἐρεῖς Ἀθηναίην
γλύψαι τὰ καλά—χαιρέτω δὲ δέσποινα.

don't you see, dear Kynno
what works are those. See, you would say Athena
chiseled these beautiful things. Hail lady![25]

βρέγμ̣[α]το[c] ἐκ δίο̣ιο cὺν ἔντ[ε]cιν ἥλαο πατρόc

Callim. fr. 37 Pf.

As when on the waves of Libyan Triton
when Hephaestus had sharpened a birthing axe
you jumped fully armed from the divine head of your father

Callimachus employs the epithet Ἀσβύστης elsewhere to refer to Libya, at *Hymn* 2.75–76 ἐκ δέ cε Θήρηc | οὖλοc Ἀριcτοτέληc Ἀcβυcτίδι πάρθετο γαίῃ [and you from Thera vigorous Aristoteles set down on Libyan land] where the epithet is explained by the scholia (λευκόγειος), and at fr. 384.6 *(The Victory of Sosibius)* Ἀcβύcτηc ἵπποc of a Libyan horse.

24.

ἠρῶσσαι Λιβύης τιμήοροι, αἵ ποτ' Ἀθήνην,
ἦμος ὅτ' ἐκ πατρὸς κεφαλῆς θόρε παμφαίνουσα,
ἀντόμεναι Τρίτωνος ἐφ' ὕδασι χυτλώσαντο.

Ap. Rh. 4.1309–11

heroines, guardians of Libya, who once
when Athena lept all resplendent from her father's head
welcomed her and bathed her in the waters of Triton.

25. Headlam (1922) 198–200 has some suggestive notes on the nature of this passage, particularly on the subtle juxtaposition of tone in the image of Athena chiseling

Such images of the gods as craftsmen of toys and statuary in the poetry of this period generally share two characteristics that affect a reading of *Iambus* 12, especially a reading of this poem as emblematic of the genre of iambic and the Alexandrian conceptualization of artistic production. The artistic production itself is not on a grand, self-consciously heroicized scale, in contrast to the great exemplar of such production, the shield of Achilles in *Iliad* 18. Rather it is on a smaller, often not entirely serious scale in the tradition of Hermes' crafting the lyre from a tortoise shell in the Homeric *Hymn to Hermes*. The emphasis in the delineation of the artistic production is as much on the action of mimesis as on the product.[26] Hence Athena not only creates, but with chisel (line 66 cμίλῃcιν) and a chiselers' accuracy (ibid. ἠκριβωμένην). Just as Apollo, albeit divine, assumes in this poem the "compositional persona," of a human poet, so Athena is given the tools and concerns of a mortal chiseler.

Dionysus? / Demeter

The divine figure of lines 36–40 has long been recognized as Demeter from the representation of her grief at the loss of her daughter (38–39). Given the pattern of pairing divine figures, there appears to be room for another deity at lines 31–35, although no one has suggested a divine subject for these five lines. Following the pattern of divine pairs Callimachus appears to juxtapose in this assembly, and with some support from the extant descriptive images in these lines, it may be possible to supply the missing figure. One Olympian deity especially associated with the Tyrrhenians (line 31 τὸ Τυρ̣ηνικ̣ὸν. [.]. . . . .[. .] . . . . [) is Dionysus. The story of the kidnapping of the young Dionysus by Tyrrhenian pirates appears first in the Homeric *Hymn to Dionysus* lines 6–8:

> τάχα δ' ἄνδρες ἐϋσσέλμου ἀπὸ νηὸς
> ληϊσταὶ προγένοντο θοῶς ἐπὶ οἶνοπα πόντον
> Τυρσηνοί·
>
> and suddenly men upon a well-benched ship,
> pirates, came forth swiftly upon the wine-dark sea,
> Tyrrhenians.

---

statues of nude boys and the apotropaic reverential address χαιρέτω δὲ δέσποινα. The feature of this passage of Herodas which particularly touches a reading of *Iambus* 12.27–28 is the speaker's need to make such an apotropaic address when evoking the image of Athena with chisel.

26. One of the best examples of this phenomenon, although there are many, is the description of the goatherd's cup in Theocr. *Idyll* 1.

This episode of the youth of Dionysus, with the transformation of the Tyrrhenian pirates into dolphins, appears to have been highly popular throughout antiquity, and is, of course, the subject of the Exekias cup. Ovid narrates the metamorphosis of the sailors at *Met.* 3.577–691. The text at line 31 of *Iambus* 12 may have read something like καὶ τὸ Τυρϲηνό̣[ν] (Τυρϲηνικόν will not scan), as substantive or with adjectival force, referring to some aspect of Dionysus' kidnapping. The episode of the metamorphosis of the Tyrrhenian pirates is an event of the youth of Dionysus, and therefore, like the initial purification of Athena in the Tritonian waters of Libya, appropriate in this setting of celebration of a goddess' birth.

Two other features of these lines may lend support to this conjecture. Line 33 παίχνια χρυϲοῖο τιμηέϲ[τ]ε̣ρ̣[α [playthings more to be honored than gold] is an image of luxury appropriate to this god.[27] Lines 36–39 evoke Hades' rape of Persephone. As the rape of Dionysus is the subject of the Homeric *Hymn to Dionysus,* so that of Persephone is the subject of the opening of the Homeric *Hymn to Demeter.* Once again the allusion to the god in question, here Persephone, is to a tale of the young divinity. The analogy of the two Homeric hymns may be more than thematic. In considering line 40 of *Iambus* 12 ἵπποϲ αϲ̣τ̣ι̣[. . . .]δ̣[. .]η̣ν [.]. κ̣η̣ν κρο. [.]. two features of the opening of the Homeric *Hymn to Demeter* may well be worth keeping in mind. (1) On Persephone's plucking the narcissus, the earth opens (lines 16–18) and Hades arises on his horses ὄρουσεν ἄναξ πολυδέγμων | ἵπποις ἀθανάτοισι. (2) In regard to the last fragmentary syllable κρο among the flowers the young goddess is gathering in the early lines of the Homeric hymn is the κρόκον (line 6), and the patronymic of Hades is Κρόνου (line 18).

The choice of Dionysus fits particularly well the apparent pattern of pairing of Olympians in the poem.[28] The two gods whom the poet directly addresses are Artemis and Apollo, the two he first mentions in the context of the celebration of Hebe's birth are Hera and Zeus, the first pair of detailed givers of gifts are Athena and Poseidon (each two lines). The logical next pair is Dionysus and Demeter (each five

27. On the comparison cf. Sappho fr. 156 L.-P. πόλυ πάκτιδοϲ ἀδυμελεϲτέρα . . . | χρύϲω χρυϲοτέρα . . . the Tyrrhenians are traditionally also associated with luxury, which may be part of the force of the epithet at line 31.

28. The other deity who naturally comes to mind in association with the Tyrrhenians is Hermes, particularly given the Tyrrhenian origin of the statue of Hermes in *Iambus* 9. Hermes is also one of the gift-givers at the marriage of Cadmus and Harmony at Nonn. *Dion.* 5.125–39; this passage clearly looks to *Iambus* 12 in some respects, but is not an exact imitation. The pairing of gods in *Iambus* 12, however, favors the pair Dionysus / Demeter.

lines); Demeter is almost certainly the subject, with her daughter, of lines 36–40.

The pairing of Dionysus and Demeter is a *topos* of ancient literature.[29] Callimachus himself evokes the pair in his *Hymn to Demeter* (6.70–71):

καὶ γὰρ τᾷ Δάματρι cυνωργίcθη Διόνυcοc·
τόccα Διώνυcον γὰρ ἃ καὶ Δάματρα χαλέπτει.

For Dionysus became angry with Demeter
for whatever troubles Dionysus troubles also Demeter.

Hephaestus

Clearly at line 41 we have a new male deity (ἦλθε χὠ). I follow Pfeiffer's suggestion that Hephaestus is the subject of lines 41–44. J. Rea has read α̣ιcτ̣οc rather than λ̣ιcτ̣οc at line 43 (i.e. Ἥφαιcτοc), and it is logical that Hephaestus, as the rival to whom Apollo refers by name (line 57 Ἡφαίcτεια), would incur extensive description before lines 45–46, which are a summary of the figures at this gathering. Hephaestus and his gift would then be the subject of lines 41–44; so we may understand the masculine singular article χὠ at line 41, the masculine singular participle ἄ[γ]ων at the end of line 42, and the gender and number of ἐργάτηc [workman] at line 43. The application of the term ἐργάτηc to a god is another instance of the poet's vivid transference of the language of mortal craftsmanship to the gods; Callimachus creates a certain realism in this competition by portraying craft in human terms.

Hephaestus appears alone as subject of these four lines. It seems then that the poet either discontinues the pairing of gods at the end of the summary of the participants, or that Apollo is meant to be understood as a member of two pairs, of Artemis / Apollo connected with the larger poem (*Iambus* 12), and of Apollo / Hephaestus connected with the story of the divine contest (the poem's paradigm). The identity of the figure addressed at line 44 cε̣ is admittedly unclear. Among the possible options are an apostrophe of (1) Hebe (cf. line 73 cε̣ νύμφα) or (2) Hephaestus by the poet, or that (3) this address is part of the gods' contesting among one another which is the subject of the next two lines. Less likely is an apostrophe of Apollo, as the cletic-hymnic introduction of the god at line 47, which parallels that of Artemis in line 1, would seem to obviate an address to the same god a few lines earlier.

29. Cf. Pindar *I.* 7.3–5, Eur. *Bacch.* 274–80.

Lines 45–46 frame the assembly of contesting gods begun at lines 23–24. Callimachus underscores the framing with verbal repetition; δ̣ό̣cει / δω[τί]νη[c, οἱ δ'/οἱ δ'. Pfeiffer's suggested restoration of lines 23–25 is the more attractive for the repetition ἤ̣ρ̣[ι]c̣α̣ν̣ / ἔριν, and the reader is struck as well by the repetition of initial sounds in θ̣ε̣οί / ἤ̣[μεν]ο̣[ι] and θ]έντεc ἡμ[ι]λλῶν̣το. Both passages present a humorously paradoxical image of a friendly contest (γλυκεῖαν̣ . . . ἔριν), a contest quite unlike the polemical relations between poets that Callimachus delineates elsewhere in his work.[30]

APOLLO'S SONG

At line 47 Δ]ήλι' ἄπολλον, cὺ δ' [But you, Delian Apollo] the narrator of the divine contest turns to a second divine addressee. Apollo is the addressee of this interior song, as Artemis (line 1 Ἄρτειμι) is of the larger poem, *Iambus* 12. Callimachus develops a juxtaposition in these lines of epic attributes, or possessions, of Apollo, attributes that are themselves physical entities (e.g. κτη]μάτων line 49, τρίπουc line 51), and Apollo's new τέχνη [artistic skill]. Callimachus, singer of the divine contest, invokes these attributes, attributes of Apollo, as subject of song. Apollo himself, however, calls upon his new skill (55–56), which will produce a gift that will both surpass and outlast the gifts of the other gods, gifts that are physical entities that will fade with time. Through this dual presentation and dual apostrophe (the poet of Apollo Δ]ήλι' ἄπολλον, Apollo, the poet, of himself ὦ Φοῖβε) Callimachus both underscores the novelty of this figure, Apollo the Alexandrian poet, and calls attention to the tradition against which he fashions this figure.[31] Further, he draws a close analogy of two singers, the mortal singing of the divine, the divine singing of mortal fallibility.

30. Theocritus (*Id.* 17.112–14) uses the term δωτίνη specifically of the reward given by patron (here Ptolemy II Philadelphus) to successful poet;

> οὐδὲ Διωνύσου τις ἀνὴρ ἱεροὺς κατ' ἀγῶνας
> ἵκετ' ἐπιστάμενος λιγυρὰν ἀναμέλψαι ἀοιδάν,
> ᾧ οὐ δωτίναν ἀντάξιον ὥπασε τέχνας.
>
> Nor does any man come to the sacred contests of Dionysus
> skilled in raising a clear-sounding song
> to whom he does not provide a gift worthy of his skill.

The parallel terms for song, skill, and gift are those of Alexandrian (and specifically Callimachean) poetics and, moreover, those of the singer of this song in *Iambus* 12, Apollo.

31. The effect is similar to a device he uses frequently in the hymns; e.g. *Hymn* 1.60–67 on the fallacy of the division of realms among Zeus and his brothers, *Hymn* 6.10–23 on the impropriety of telling of the sorrows of Demeter on the loss of her daughter.

R. Pfeiffer in his original edition of Callimachus' fragments (vol. 1, 1949) believed that the self-address of Apollo consisted only of the two lines 54–55, and that the apostrophe ὦ Φοῖβε at line 56, reflecting that of the poet at line 47 Δ]ήλι' ἄπολλον, served as a framing device and signified a return to the earlier speaker. The subsequent publication in 1951 of *P. Mich.* inv. 4967 demonstrated that the soliloquy of Apollo extends at least to about line 72. Pfeiffer includes this fragment in the Addenda to his second volume (1953). We know now that in *Iambus* 12 there are two singers, Callimachus and Apollo, two gifts of song and two paradigms.

Callimachus heightens the juxtapostion of Apollo the god of poetry and Apollo the poet with contrasting imagery of epic grandeur and Callimachean poetic technique. His own apostrophe of the god evokes the divine figure; Πυθῶνοc ἀρχα[ίηc, ἠΰτει τρίπουc, ὑπώροφοι are all images of the divine figure, as is the verb of speech ἐφ[θέγ]ξω. Callimachus never uses φθέγγομαι of the human voice, with one deliberately ironic exception—the animals in the fable of *Iambus* 2 once endowed with the faculty of human speech.[32] Where Callimachus uses the verb φθέγγομαι elsewhere in his poetry, there is a marked association of this verb of speech with the god Apollo.[33] On the other hand, at line 56 χρεὼ cοφῆc ὦ Φοῖβε π. [. .]. cθ. . τ̣έχνηc Apollo uses the same terms of his own act of poetic composition here that he uses in the *Aetia* prologue (lines 17–18) in his exhortation to the poet Callimachus αὖθι δὲ τέχνη̣ | κρίνετε,]ιμὴ cχοίνϳῳ Πέρcιδι τὴινϳ cοφίην.

Callimachus draws the sense of identity of poet-narrator and poet-god closely at many other points in the following lines, highlighting the features shared by both singers in their act of composition. Line 57 νικήḷc̣ει̣ is an agonistic term at once vivid and deliberate; Callimachus characterizes the gift-giving of the gods in terms of a contest of σοφία [creative art]. νικήḷc̣ει̣ in Apollo's soliloquy parallels the νικάτω (line 75) of the last line of the god's speech, a wish for victory that speaks as well to Callimachus' own act of giving. Other parallels that underscore the paradigm of the poet-god include the recurring appearance of the child Hebe, line 68 τῇ παιδί and line 75 π[αι]δ̣ί̣, for Callimachus' song is also a gift for a small child. Both singers use the same language of song: line 68 καλλίcτη δόcι̣c̣ [(Apollo of his own gift) and line 24 [.

32. *Iambus* 2.1–3 τό τε πτηνόν | καὶ τοὺν θαλάccῃ καὶ τὸ τετράπουν αὔτωc | ἐφθέγγεθ' ὡc ὁ πηλὸc ὁ Προμήθειοc. The use of the verb in the opening of *Iambus* 2 is part of a play on the elevated language and imagery of cosmological poetry, as obviously is the characterization of man as "the Promethean clay."

33. Cf. *Hymn* 4.264–65 αὐτὴ δὲ χρυcέοιο ἀπ' οὔδεοc εἵλεο παῖδα, | ἐν δ' ἐβάλευ κόλποιcιν, ἔποc δ' ἐφθέγξαο τοῖον·

καλ]λίcτῃ δ̣ό̣cει (the poetic narrator). The repetitions of personal address have the same effect: line 47 Δ]ήλι' ὤπολλον (the poet to the god), line 56 ὦ Φοῖβε (the god to himself), line 43 Ἥφ]αι̣cτοc (the poet speaking) and line 57 Ἡφαίcτεια (the god speaking).

In his characterization of Apollo as poet in *Iambus* 12, Callimachus self-consciously takes a trope of poetic imagery one step further. In his own *Hymn to Apollo* (2) Callimachus portrays Apollo not only as the traditional singer among the gods and patron of singers,[34] but in his portrayal of the young god building the altar of bone at Delos, Callimachus chooses some metaphors that have a deliberately ambiguous quality, metaphors from earlier epic and choral poetry that are also used of the composition of song:

55 Φοίβῳ δ' ἑcπόμενοι πόλιαc **διεμετρήcαντο**
ἄνθρωποι· Φοῖβοc γὰρ ἀεὶ πολίεccι φιληδεῖ
κτιζομένῃc', αὐτὸc δὲ θεμείλια Φοῖβοc **ὑφαίνει.**
τετραέτηc τὰ πρῶτα θεμείλια Φοῖβοc **ἔπηξε**
καλῇ ἐν Ὀρτυγίῃ περιηγέοc ἐγγύθι λίμνηc.
60 Ἄρτεμιc ἀγρώccουcα καρήατα cυνεχὲc αἰγῶν
Κυνθιάδων φορέεcκεν, ὁ δ' **ἔπλεκε** βωμὸν Ἀπόλλων,
δείματο μὲν κεράεccιν ἐδέθλια, **πῆξε** δὲ βωμόν
ἐκ κεράων, κεραοὺc δὲ πέριξ **ὑπεβάλλετο** τοίχουc.
ὧδ' ἔμαθεν τὰ πρῶτα θεμείλια Φοῖβοc ἐγείρειν.
Callim. *Hy.* 2.55–64

55 And men in following Apollo have measured out cities.
For ever does Phoebus take pleasure in the founding of cities,
and he himself weaves the foundations.
At four years of age Phoebus fixed his first foundations
in fair Ortygia near the circular lake.
60 Artemis after the hunt was ever bringing the heads of Cynthian goats
and Apollo plaited an altar, and with horns he laid
the foundations, and of horns he constructed an altar,

34.

τέχνῃ δ' ἀμφιλαφὴc οὔτιc τόcον ὅccον Ἀπόλλων·
κεῖνοc ὀϊcτευτὴν ἔλαχ' ἀνέρα, κεῖνοc ἀοιδόν
(Φοίβῳ γὰρ καὶ τόξον ἐπιτρέπεται καὶ ἀοιδή),
κείνου δὲ θριαὶ καὶ μάντιεc· ἐκ δέ νυ Φοίβου
ἰητροὶ δεδάαcιν ἀνάβληcιν θανάτοιο.
Callim. *Hy.* 2.42–46

No one is so endowed with skill as Apollo.
For he has as his share the bowman, and he the singer
(for to Phoebus are entrusted both the bow and song)
and of him are all divination pebbles and seers. And too from
Phoebus have doctors learned the postponement of death.

and walls of horn he cast around it.
Thus did Phoebus learn to raise his first foundations.

The finite verbs highlighted above show a clever variation in rhetorical effect. Some are drawn from the technical vocabulary appropriate to a demonstration of the god's σοφία in building; διαμετρέω, πήγνυμι, δέμω, and ὑποβάλλω are all verbs widely attested in descriptions of the foundations of cities. Yet the other two verbs highlighted, ὑφαίνω and πλέκω, are semantically ambiguous. Both are used in archaic and classical poetry as metaphors for the composition of song, although neither is per se inappropriate in speaking of a divinity creating a city.[35] Yet the use of these metaphors of song, following closely the portrayal of Apollo as patron of song and singers (lines 42–46), effects an image of the unity of the god's creative prowess and holds the figure of the singer-god somewhat longer before the audience.[36] Callimachus casts Apollo's creation of the Delian altar as, in part, a poetic act.

The poet infuses his portrayal of the creative child-god in *Hymn* 2 with features of the divine. The altar of bone at Delos was one of the wonders of the ancient world. Similarly the description of the god and of his attributes, while highlighting the god's eternal youth, as does Apollo's self-description in *Iambus* 12.69–70, includes a close identification of the god with material wealth and especially with gold.[37] There

35. Cf. Theocr. *Id.* 1.52–4 as a parallel for the same semantic doubleness in language of composition.

36. The section of *Hymn* 2 that immediately follows, the longest section of the poem, is the identification of Apollo with the foundation of Cyrene and with the Battiadae, from whom Callimachus claims descent. Hence the retention of the figure of the singer-god serves to accentuate the sense of identification of the poet and the god.

37.

χρύcεα τὠπόλλωνι τό τ' ἐνδυτὸν ἥ τ' ἐπιπορπίc
ἥ τε λύρη τό τ' ἄεμμα τὸ Λύκτιον ἥ τε φαρέτρη,
χρύcεα καὶ τὰ πέδιλα· πολύχρυcοc γὰρ Ἀπόλλων
καὶ πουλυκτέανοc· Πυθῶνί κε τεκμήραιο.
καὶ μὲν ἀεὶ καλὸc καὶ ἀεὶ νέοc· οὔποτε Φοίβου
θηλείαιc οὐδ' ὅccον ἐπὶ χνόοc ἦλθε παρειαῖc,
αἱ δὲ κόμαι θυόεντα πέδῳ λείβουcιν ἔλαια·
οὐ λίποc Ἀπόλλωνοc ἀποcτάζουcιν ἔθειραι,
ἀλλ' αὐτὴν πανάκειαν· ἐν ἄcτεϊ δ' ᾧ κεν ἐκεῖναι
πρῶκεc ἔραζε πέcωcιν, ἀκήρια πάντ' ἐγένοντο.

Callim. *Hy.* 2.32–41

Of gold is the raiment of Apollo, and of gold his mantle,
his lyre, his Lyctian bow, and his quiver,
and of gold are his sandles. For Apollo has much gold

is no suggestion here, nor in the parallel description of Asteria at the hour of Apollo's birth at *Hymn* 4.260–65,[38] that this metal is in any sense pernicious or its acquisition ephemeral. Rather this is the material of epic description, particularly associated with the divine.

The characterization of Apollo in *Iambus* 12 offers a double surprise. The narrator addresses Apollo in cletic-hymnic form (line 47) and gives, as his audience might then expect, some of the god's divine attributes and possessions (lines 48–53). Yet Apollo in his own words turns away from these attributes to those of Callimachean poetics. Not only does Apollo fashion himself as a Callimachean poet, but he also delineates the divine contest in the traditional terms of competition in a contest of σοφία.[39]

The second surprising element of this soliloquy is the evaluation of gold. Rather than being the material that befits the divine, the material of epic portrayal of gods, or even the symbol of mortal excellence, as is the case with Bathycles' cup in *Iambus* 1,[40] Apollo denigrates gold

---

and many possessions. You might witness this by Pytho.
And ever is he beautiful, and ever young. Never came
upon Phoebus' feminine cheeks even down,
and his locks drip fragrant oil upon the ground.
Not grease—but the very panacea do his locks let fall.
And in whatever city those drops fall to the ground,
all things there are free from harm.

38.

χρύcεά τοι τότε πάντα θεμείλια γείνετο Δῆλε,
χρυcῷ δὲ τροχόεcca πανήμεροc ἔρρεε λίμνη,
χρύcειον δ' ἐκόμηcε γενέθλιον ἔρνοc ἐλαίηc,
χρυcῷ δὲ πλήμυρε βαθὺc Ἰνωπὸc ἐλιχθείc.
αὐτὴ δὲ χρυcέοιο ἀπ' οὔδεοc εἵλεο παῖδα,
ἐν δ' ἐβάλευ κόλποιcιν, ἔποc δ' ἐφθέγξαο τοῖον·

Callim. *Hy.* 4.260–265

Of gold then, Delos, became all your foundations,
and all day did the round marsh flow with gold,
and the native shoot of the olive was covered with golden foliage,
and with gold was coiled deep Inopus in flood.
And you yourself took up the child from the golden ground,
and cast him in your lap, and uttered a word of this kind:

39. See M. Griffith, "Contest and Contradiction in Early Greek Poetry," in *Cabinet of the Muses: Essays on Classical and Comparative Literature in Honor of Thomas G. Rosenmeyer,* ed. M. Griffith and D. J. Mastronarde (Atlanta, 1990), 188–92.

40. *Iambus* 1.65 τοὐλόχρυcον and Dieg. VI 8 χρυcοῦν ἔκπωμα.

From the many examples of gold symbolizing the eternal nature of mortal excellence, cf. e.g. Simonides fr. 16 W.:

κάλλιστον μάρτυν ἔθεντο πόνων,
χρυσοῦ τιμήεντος ἐjν αἰθέριι· καί σφιν ἀέξει

here as both something of ephemeral value and as a source of corruption, a characterization not of the divine material, but of the mortal metal.[41] There is a further subtle irony in the image of gold's fading value. For it is not among immortals that gold corrupts, nor among immortals that gold and other metals will in any respect fade with time. As in the *Aetia* prologue the identity of poet and god is drawn closely here; the god is the poet, and gives voice to the poet's own declarative statement. The singer of the narrative frame has become one with the singer of the paradigm, and in this way attains greater authority as a didactic voice.

So too Apollo's reference to the monstrous origin of gold is a reference to the material that is the source of mortal corruption. The tone of this reference would not escape the poem's audience. The

---

αὐτῶν τ' εὐρεῖαν κλῃδόνια καὶ πατέρων
]ɳολυ̣[

they set the fairest witness of their labors—
gold which is honored in heaven. And it will magnify
their own sounded reputation and that of their fathers.

41. For the sense two passages from Aesch. *Ag.* are especially worth comparing:

οὐ γὰρ ἔcτιν ἔπαλξιc
πλούτου πρὸc Κόρον ἀνδρὶ
λακτίcαντι μέγαν Δίκαc
βωμὸν εἰc ἀφάνειαν.

Aesch *Ag.* 381–84

For there is no defense
for a man who in satiety of wealth
has kicked the great altar of Justice
into obscurity.

Δίκα δὲ λάμπει μὲν ἐν
δυcκάπνοιc δώμαcιν,
τὸν δ' ἐναίcιμον τίει·
τὰ χρυcόπαcτα δ' ἔδεθλα cὺν
πίνωι χερῶν παλιντρόποιc
ὄμμαcι λιποῦc' ὅcια †προcέβα
τοῦ†, δύναμιν οὐ cέβουcα πλού-
του παράcημον αἴνωι·

Aesch. *Ag.* 773–80

But Justice shines
in smoke-filled houses,
and honors the righteous man.
But the gold-spangled seats
where there is filth upon the hands
with averted eyes she leaves for what is holy
not honoring the power of wealth
falsely stamped with praise.

ants of India and the gold in their native sand is a common image in Greek literature, particularly in the context of Alexander's Indian campaign.[42] Herodotus provides one of the earliest accounts of these ants (3.102.2):

> ἐν δὴ ὧν τῇ ἐρημίῃ ταύτῃ καὶ τῇ ψάμμῳ γίνονται μύρμηκες μεγάθεα ἔχοντες κυνῶν μὲν ἐλάσσονα, ἀλωπέκων δὲ μέζονα· εἰσὶ γὰρ αὐτῶν καὶ παρὰ βασιλέϊ τῶν Περσέων ἐνθεύτεν θηρευθέντες. οὗτοι ὧν οἱ μύρμηκες ποιεύμενοι οἴκησιν ὑπὸ γῆν ἀναφορέουσι τὴν ψάμμον κατά περ οἱ ἐν τοῖσι Ἕλλησι μύρμηκες κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον, εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ τὸ εἶδος ὁμοιότατοι· ἡ δὲ ψάμμος ἡ ἀναφερομένη ἐστὶ χρυσῖτις.
>
> And in this sandy desert there are ants in size smaller than dogs but larger than foxes. For there are some of these, which were caught there, kept at the palace of the Persian king. These ants, when they make their dwelling below ground, bring up sand in the same manner as Greek ants, and are very similar in form. The sand that they bring up is full of gold.

The Indian ants appeared in many sources;[43] it is not imperative to assume a Callimachean allusion to Herodotus here, nor need the word κύνες, a fairly common Greek poetic word for *monstrum,* be a play on the Herodotean description.[44] We should not, however, exclude a play on the Herodotean passage. There appear to be a number of other possible allusions to Herodotus in the *Iambi.*

The Indian ants may appear elsewhere in Callimachus. In his encomiastic poem the *Victory of Sosibius* (fr. 384 Pf.), lines 14–15 read:

> ἰθυτάτη, χρυ̣σὸν δ' εὐδικίη παραθεῖ̣,
> χρυ̣σὸν ὃν ἀνθρώποι[ς]ι καλὸν κακὸν ετρα. . [.]. . . . . ξ

The last line has now been supplemented to read:[45]

> χρυ̣σὸν ὃν ἀνθρώποισι καλὸν κακὸν ἔτραφ̣[ε] μ̣ύρ̣μ̣η̣ξ
>
> the gold which the ant reared to be a fair evil for men.

The message of the *Victory of Sosibius* that correct judgment surpasses gold bears an obvious similarity to the message of Apollo in *Iambus* 12. Although the aphorism of fr. 384 is conventional in the tradition of

42. See esp. Arrian *Ind.* 15.5–70.

43. Cf. esp. the scholion to Theocr. 17.106–7 περὶ δὲ τῶν μυρμήκων τῶν μεταλλευόντων χρυσὸν ἐν Ἰνδικοῖς πολλοὶ ἱστορήκασιν.

44. It has now been argued (W. K. Pritchett [1993] 90–94, J. Romm [1998] 78) that the creatures Herodotus is describing are not ants but a species of marmot or groundhog.

45. Pfeiffer Add. et Corr. II 121, H. Herter, *Gnomon* 26 (1954): 80.

epinician, nonetheless the parallel of both aphorism and of the image of the Indian ants is striking. As elsewhere in Callimachus ethical statement transcends generic boundary.

As with its monstrous origin, so irony lies in the image of gold's fading value (line 67 ὁ πρόcω φοιτέων ἀμαυ|ρώcει χρ̣[ό]νοc). Gold, again, corrupts mortals, not immortals. These lines of Apollo's speech consist of a series of such paradoxical statements. Line 69 ἔcτ' ἐμὸν γένειον ἀγνεύη̣ | τριχόc plays again on the juxtaposition of mortal and immortal. The irony of this line lies in Apollo's immortality; his song will endure as long as his youth, which is eternal. The allusion to Apollo's eternally hairless chin, the evocation of the poet-god's agelessness, finds a contrasting resonance in Callimachus' own poetic self-imaging as the poet weighed down by age, whose own song will not fade as he grows old.[46]

Line 70 καὶ ἐρίφοιc χαίρωcιν ἅρπ|αγ[εc λ]ύκ̣[ο]ι [and so long as rapacious wolves delight in kids] calls forth a different image of the eternal, one which has occasioned several imaginative interpretations.[47] As a Homeric simile, the image of wolves and kids appears in passages of particular grimness.[48] The predatory image is also one familiar in erotic contexts.[49] E. Grassi points to the parallel at Plato's *Phaedrus* 241c6–d1[50] ταῦτά τε οὖν χρή, ὦ παῖ, συννοεῖν, καὶ εἰδέναι τὴν ἐραστοῦ φιλίαν ὅτι

46. Cf. fr. 1 Pf. lines 37–38 . . . . . Μοῦcαι γ|ὰρ ὅcουc ἴδον ὄθμαιτ|ι παῖδαc | μὴ λοξῷ, πολιοὺc| οὐκ ἀπέθεντο φίλουc. The image of the swan's last song that has been suggested for the following lines of fr. 1 follows the same theme. See N. Hopkinson's suggested text (1988) 16 Μουσάων δὲ καὶ ὄρνι]ς, ἐ[πεὶ] πτερὸν οὐκέτι κινεῖν | οἶδε, πέλει φων]ῆι τ[ῆ]μος ἐνεργότατος. See also G. Crane, "Tithonus and the Prologue to Callimachus' Aetia", *ZPE* 66 (1986): 269–78.

47. G. Luck, "Kids and Wolves (An Interpretation of Callimachus, fr. 202.69–70 Pf.)," *CQ,* n.s., 9 (1959): 34–37.

48. Cf. *Il.* 16.351–56:

> Οὗτοι ἄρ' ἡγεμόνες Δαναῶν ἔλον ἄνδρα ἕκαστος.
> ὡς δὲ λύκοι ἄρνεσσιν ἐπέχραον ἢ ἐρίφοισι
> σίνται, ὑπὲκ μήλων αἱρεύμενοι, αἵ τ' ἐν ὄρεσσι
> ποιμένος ἀφραδίῃσι διέτμαγεν· οἱ δὲ ἰδόντες
> αἶψα διαρπάζουσιν ἀνάλκιδα θυμὸν ἐχούσας·
> ὣς Δαναοὶ Τρώεσσιν ἐπέχραον·

Il. 24.258–62:

> Ἕκτορά θ', ὃς θεὸς ἔσκε μετ' ἀνδράσιν, οὐδὲ ἐῴκει
> ἀνδρός γε θνητοῦ πάϊς ἔμμεναι, ἀλλὰ θεοῖο.
> τοὺς μὲν ἀπώλεσ' Ἄρης, τὰ δ' ἐλέγχεα πάντα λέλειπται,
> ψεῦσταί τ' ὀρχησταί τε, χοροιτυπίῃσιν ἄριστοι,
> ἀρνῶν ἠδ' ἐρίφων ἐπιδήμιοι ἁρπακτῆρες.

49. Cf. Hor. *Epod.* 15.7, *dum pecori lupus et nautis infestus Orion,* where Horace sets the hostile image in an erotic oath.

50. *Parola del Passato* 11 (1956): 207–208.

οὐ μετ' εὐνοίας γίγνεται, ἀλλὰ σιτίου τρόπον, χάριν πλησμονῆς, ὡς λύκοι ἄρνας ἀγαπῶσιν, ὡς παῖδα φιλοῦσιν ἐρασταί. [And then these things, boy, you must keep in mind, and know that a lover's affection does not derive from goodwill, but is in nature like food, for the sake of satiety, just as wolves love lambs, so lovers love a boy.] Callimachus' erotic poetry plays with Platonic imagery elsewhere, and may well be doing so here. There may also be a linguistic play in this line on the cult-title Ἀπόλλων ὁ Λύκιος. Callimachus so designates Apollo in one particularly important passage where he composes a similar bond of poet-god and poet-singer, Apollo's opening lines to the poet in the *Aetia* prologue (fr. 1.21–23 Pf.):

καὶ γὰρ ὅτε πριώτιστον ἐμοῖς ἐπὶ δέλτον ἔθηκα
γούνασιν, Ἀ[πό]λλων εἶπεν ὅ μοι Λύκιος·
'. . . . .]. . . ἀοιδέ, etc.

For when first I set my tablet upon my knees
Lycian Apollo said to me:
'. . . . .]. . . Singer, etc.

There are further two oblique references to this aspect of Apollo in *Hymn* 2, line 19 Λυκωρέος ἔντεα Φοίβου and line 33 τό τ' ἄεμμα τὸ Λύκτιον. Here this cult aspect of Apollo is associated with the rape of the nymph Cyrene, the anthropomorphic image of the poet's native country. In this subtle way the poet in *Hymn* 2 personalizes the god, giving strength to the bond of mortal singer and divine one.

I suggest that in *Iambus* 12 Callimachus casts this bond in a different way, as a close identification of himself and his divine counterpart, of mortal and divine poet. Not only are Apollo's poetics (τέχνη, σοφία) Callimachean, but Callimachean themes, mortal venality, the aging poet, and the poet-*erastes* [poet-lover], are, in one way or another, those of Apollo's song.

We can only conjecture how Callimachus finally wove the paradigm of the victorious Apollo back into his own act of giving. The concluding, broken extant lines appear to return first to the scene on Olympus, and then to the poem's celebratory occasion, and the poet's own gift. It is not clear who is addressed at line 73 σε̣. Assuming the reading σε̣ is correct, there are two referents at line 73: σε̣ and νύμφα. If Apollo's soliloquy has ended at this point and the poet has returned to the narrative of gift-giving on Olympus, σε̣ might then refer to Apollo in apposition to the σύ of line 47; Callimachus then twice invoking the god. Alternatively, if, as Pfeiffer suggests, Apollo's soliloquy ends at line 75, the apposition may be to Apollo's self-address at line 56 ὦ Φοῖβε.

Apollo in song is often accompanied,[51] and nymphs or the Fates here might fulfill this function. We may read in lines 76–78 two images which recall the act of poetic composition itself, line 77 μιμειcθ̣ . . [and line 78 τέξ[ο]μα̣ι[, emblematic of both songs and as well of the Alexandrian emphasis on the delineation of the act of μίμησις as well as its product.

The final extant lines of *Iambus* 12 appear to return to the poetic setting of Callimachus' opening hymnic address; line 82 Κρήcιον and possibly line 86 ὠγα̣θ̣ή seem to invoke Cretan Artemis and the probable setting of the celebrant's birth. If we accept Barber's conjecture at line 82 κουρ]ο̣τρόφε[52] we have a parallel in Callimachus' address to Delos in *Hymn* 4.2 Δῆλον Ἀπόλλωνοc κουροτρόφον, one of several intertextual allusions in these two poems, both sharing the god Apollo, divine birth, and a divine voice that speaks for the mortal poet.

Iambus 13 opens with the poet's hymnic invocation of Apollo, an appropriation of divine inspiration beginning a poem in which Callimachus defends his own poetic voice. *Iambus* 12 exhibits a different act of appropriation–Callimachus fashions Apollo as himself, as a poet justifying his act of composition and as a poet whose song, with its variety of compositional models and generic coloring, is itself emblematic of *polyeideia*. The order of these poems, with their different uses of Apollo as valorizing authority, is consciously conceived.

Iambus 1.32–77

THE CONTEST OF THE SEVEN SAGES

The central panel of *Iambus* 1 is Callimachus' rendition of the parable of Bathycles' cup. This panel is in turn bounded by a frame in which the speaker is a Hipponactean poetic persona, and the frame is textured with the language and imagery of traditional iambic, with a number of parallels in Hipponax' extant poetry. It is possible that Callimachus' choice of parable is also an assertion of his authority as a Hipponactean voice. The archaic poet himself may have composed a version of this parable, or some aspects of it. Two fragments of Hipponax suggest a version of the same tale of the Seven Sages:

καὶ Μύσων, ὃν Ὑπόλλων
ἀνεῖπεν ἀνδρῶν σωφρονέστατον πάντων.
(Hippon. fr. 63 W., 65 Deg.)

51. As by the Muses at the marriage of Cadmus and Harmony, cf. *Theogn.* lines 15–16.
52. Barber (1955) 242.

and Myson, whom Apollo
decreed the most moderate of all men.

καὶ δικάζεσθαι Βίαντος τοῦ Πριηνέως κρέσσον.
(Hippon. fr. 123 W., 12 Deg.)

and to be judged better than Bias of Priene.

Whereas Bias of Priene is one of the Seven Sages in Callimachus' version, Myson is not; if Callimachus is drawing at all on his predecessor, it is only in part.[53] However, in a poem where the speaker is cast in the voice of Hipponax, a novel retelling of a Hipponactean theme itself helps to confirm Callimachus in an iambic tradition. The parable tells of the death of an old man in a state of blessedness, εὐδαιμονία, surrounded in familial harmony by his many sons, of the realization of his final wish and the collegial self-effacement of the Seven Sages, each inclining to the superiority of another. We can only hypothesize to what purpose Hipponax may have recounted this tale. Callimachus, however, has a set purpose. The tale is meant to serve as a paradigm for the literati who gather around the narrator in a noisy atmosphere of disharmony and querulousness (line 33 ὦ λῷστε μὴ κλίμαινε). The contrast between the two settings, the different groups of figures and the narrator's perception of each could hardly be more marked. The poet's choice of paradigm is particularly effective here in creating this juxtaposition. Further, the Hipponactean narrator, by associating himself with the Seven Sages, effectively brings himself to their level,[54] thus greatly valorizing his attempted instruction of his unruly audience.

The immediate source of Callimachus' version, according to Diogenes Laertius (1.21) is Leandrius of Miletus.[55] The length of the diegete's summary of Callimachus' narrative quite possibly suggests that the diegete is aware of alternative versions. Further, the diegete appears at the end of his summary not only to return to an account of the poem's end, but to attempt an assessment of the parable. The change in the final lines of the Diegesis from narrative to second-person address suggests that the diegete ended with a citation:

53. See Dawson (1950) 24, Masson (1962) 138–39 and 166–67, B. Snell *Die Sieben Weisen, Leben und Meinungen* (Munich, 1971), 67–69, Degani (1984) 45–47, Hunter (1997) 48, S. A. White "Callimachus and the Seven Sages" (forthcoming), 3, 13.

54. On the Seven Sages as σοφοί see White (1999) 2–5. In his use of σοφία as a term for his own poetics Callimachus appropriates the moral and also scientific connotations of the term to the plane of poetic composition.

55. See Gerhard (1909) 194–97, 228–84.

τοιγαρ[οῦν
ἔφη . [. . . . .]αιο . [. . . . .] ἀλλήλων̣
κρ . τ[. . . . .]ι̣ο̣ι̣ς̣τ̣[. . . . . ἐ**]ρίζεσθε**.
Dieg. VI 19–21

The text is very fragmentary at this point; nonetheless, the inferential particle τοιγαρ[οῦν (cf. *GP* 566–68), the reflexive plural ἀλλήλων̣, and the return to the person of the poetic narrator in ἔφη[56] (cf. line 2 ὑποτίθεται) suggest that the diegete is aware of, and choosing to remark upon, the novel use to which Callimachus has put the parable.

The Seven Sages were popular figures in the Greek-speaking world, not only as figures of philosophical paradigm, but also as figures of folk tradition. They reflect the multileveled nature of wisdom literature of the archaic and classical periods. The choice of a parable from wisdom literature is emblematic of Callimachus' larger purpose in the opening poem of his *Iambi*. Callimachus is clearly aware not only of this particular parable concerning the Seven Sages, but of other versions of the parable. S. A. White has recently written succinctly on the significance of Callimachus' particular rendition in light of the differing versions of the tale that existed in the early Hellenistic period.[57] At the same time, the appearance of the Hipponactean persona journeying from beyond Acheron to give advice to the contentious is Callimachus' own adaptation from a tradition of such advice figures, of which the Χείρωνες of the fifth-century comic poet Cratinus are a vivid example.[58] In this context of wisdom literature fable and parable are especially at home. In *Iambus* 1 Callimachus interweaves in several ways, and at many points, aspects of what might be termed "academic" life. He casts Euhemerus and especially Thales as teaching figures,[59] of the scholarly world of the *Mouseion,* with the conventions not only of choliambic invective poetry, but of popular vocalization. In this way Callimachus refashions an archaic genre. He achieves a similar effect in the fables of *Iambi* 2 and 4, where literary polemic and discussion of poetic genre

56. If this is the correct reading. It is, however, the case that the diegete usually uses the present tense to describe the poets' statements and actions. εφη could well be the first two syllables of a longer word.

57. White (1999). On Callimachus and the philosophical reflections in his work see White (1994) 135–61.

58. Frr. 246–68 Kassel-Austin. See L. V. Kurke, "Pindar's Sixth Pythian and the Tradition of Advice Poetry," *TAPA* 120 (1990): 85–107 and her appendix, ibid. 104–7, on the tradition of mythological ὑποθῆκαι. On wisdom literature in archaic and classical Greece see West (1978) 3–25.

59. On the pose of Thales with staff and one hand pulling at his beard, see White (1999) 8.

are cloaked in the somewhat humble plumage of fables drawn from nature.

As so often in the *Iambi,* Callimachus plays with levels of tone and of elevation in the adaptation of paradigm to context. A crucial feature in his adaptation of paradigm is the fluid character of its parameters in its narrative setting, with a resulting easy transference of qualities from example to subject compared. There is frequently a fluidity between paradigm and narrative context in the *Iambi* that allows for an identification of the figure(s) of the narrative context with the figure(s) of the paradigm. One result of this fluidity can be an elevation of the figure of the narrative context, the larger poem, to that of the paradigmatic example. In *Iambus* 1 the figure of Hipponax is elevated in this way to the level of the Seven Sages.[60] The Hipponactean poetic persona is himself dispensing wisdom. He is cast in the same didactic role before the Alexandrian temple of Sarapis as Thales at the temple at Didyma (line 57), and in turn the Phrygian Euphorbus (59–66); the repeated verb γράφω (line 31 γρ]άφε͡σθε, 58 γράφοντα, 60 ἔγρι͡α]ψε) underscores this shared position, as does the didactic imagery which pervades both settings.[61] In this regard Callimachus goes beyond the already paradoxical figure of Hipponax in Hellenistic epigram who serves as an arbiter of morals, and even beyond a tradition present in the poetry of Hipponax where the poet is an arbiter of artistic aesthetics. Here in *Iambus* 1 "Hipponax" is revealed to be a source of advice to the Alexandrian literati on their aberrant behavior, a figure of wisdom from a far place (here the underworld),[62] a sage in a choliambic setting.

THE DEATHBED OF BATHYCLES (LINES 32–50)

The parable of *Iambus* 1 as we have it is in two parts: (1) the deathbed scene and the injunctions of Bathycles and (2) the journey of his son and of the goblet, the ἀρι͡στῆον, to each of the Seven Sages. Each of these two parts contrasts subtly with the other, the impending journey of the father and the journey of the son, the composition of figures in

60. I thank L. Battezzato for several helpful discussions on this point.

61. White (1999) 13 perceptively observes that both the frame and the paradigm of *Iambus* 1 capture the transition from performative to written didactic utterance. I would add that this is true already with the image of Callimachus' "Hipponax" φέρων ἴαμβον οὐ μάχην ι]άείδ]οντα [bearing an *iambos* which does not sing] in line 3.

62. Cf. R. Martin, "Hesiod's Metanastic Poetics," *Ramus* 21 (1992): 11–33 and "The Seven Sages as Performers of Wisdom," in *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece: Cult, Performance, Politics,* ed. C. Dougherty and L. Kurke (Cambridge, 1993), 108–28.

agreement together (Bathycles and his sons) and of figures in agreement apart (the Seven Sages), the first person Bathycles and the first person votive object. Both parts of the narrative contrast markedly with the situation in which the narrator finds himself, his own journey, the chaotic crowding literati who surround him, their querulous dissension and mistreatment of his authoritative voice.

The narrator introduces Bathycles as a figure of distant Arcadia, line 32 ἀνὴρ Βαθυκλῆις Ἀρκιάς. This introduction is typical of parable-openings, with reference to a central figure of a distant time and place: "there was a man, Bathycles, of Arcadia." The opening of the Ninus poem of Callimachus' near contemporary Phoenix of Colophon (fr. 1.1–2 Powell) is similar:

> Ἀνὴρ Νίνος τις ἐγένετ', ὡς ἐγὼ ἤκουω,
> Ἀσσύριος, ὅστις εἶχε χρυσίου πόντον.
>
> There was a certain Ninus, as I hear,
> an Assyrian, who had a sea of gold.

The reference to the figure of parable as of another time and place gains an additional significance when considered in an Alexandrian context, where so much of the culture of traditional Greek wisdom literature is itself of another time and place. The journey of Bathycles' son to each of the Seven Sages is not only a metaphor for a search for excellence, but a figurative journey into a collective Greek past. We should keep this aspect of the journey, and of Alexandria's temporal as well as spatial displacement,[63] in mind when considering the *Iambi* from the point of view of their "place" in a Greek literary tradition. For this mythical journey to the Ionians in *Iambus* 1, as a paradigm of the past, stands in direct contrast to the journey to now long-past Ionia that the poet of *Iambus* 13 does not take. Further, Bathycles appears in his appropriate temporal setting, whereas the Hipponactean speaker is displaced into one that is not his, the first of a series of carefully balanced contrasts between the two figures.

The poet characterizes Bathycles at the beginning of the parable as "one of the blessed of old" (line 35 τῶν πάλαι τις εὐδαίμων) at the point of making the figurative journey across Acheron. This characterization both parallels the journey thence of the Hipponactean figure (who will then journey back) and contrasts with οἱ νῦν, the literati. Their conduct distances them from the gods (as Euhemerus

63. The narrative of *Iambus* 1 encompasses a wide and varied geographical space. See Vox (1995) 283, n. 45.

at line 11 γέρων] λαλάζων ἄδικα βιβλία ψήχει [the old man chatters and scratches out his unrighteous books]), and their buzzing, swarming gathering is the antithesis of Bathycles' εὐδαιμονία.

The narrator's delineation of the deathbed scene, of the old man who, recognizing that the end of his life is at hand, has caused his sons to take up positions around his bed, is one of an ordered calm that serves as a foil for the onrush of literati at the temple of Sarapis and the strenuous efforts of the Hipponactean figure to assume a voice of authority earlier in the poem. The manner in which this scene of Bathycles' final moments is described contrasts also with the manner of description of the former gathering. In both, the narrative voice moves from a group to one individual,[64] but in the latter scene the narrative voice is able to encompass the whole group, and the final focus is on the central figure, whereas in the description of the literati the narrator is initially overwhelmed and focuses on different figures at random. White has suggested "Callimachus depicts Bathycles in a posture reminiscent of archaic funerary reliefs: reclining on a couch, no doubt holding the cup he is about to give away. . . . "[65] Such an interpretation introduces into the parable, at its beginning and apparent completion (lines 76–77), two votive objects of art, funeral relief and ἀνάθημα; their evocation borders the parable with an aspect of solemnity that Callimachus effectively juxtaposes with the traditional iambic language and imagery of the surrounding passages.

The same sense of aesthetic balance that the narrator suggests with the placing of Bathycles' sons (line 40 τοὺς μὲν ἔνθα, τοὺς δ' ἔνθα) he continues in the old man's address to them at line 47 'ὦ παῖδες ὦ ἐμαὶ τὠπιόντος ἄγκυραι). The tone of this address contrasts with the vituperative tones and exchanged insults of the addresses of speaker to audience in the surrounding frame of *Iambus* 1. The same contrast in tone may continue in β]ούλεσθε ῥέξω[of line 49, which suggests a unity of purpose deliberately at odds with the contending figures of Hipponactean poetic voice and surrounding literati. In his delineation of Bathycles' deathbed the poetic narrator configures a scene of decorous ethical instruction[66] that contrasts starkly with his own, evoking through their parallel impending journeys across Acheron the differences in the two settings.

64. On this telescopic viewing see M. W. Edwards *Homer, Poet of the* Iliad (London, 1987), 86.

65. White (1999) 2, n. 7. The scene may have some reminiscence of iconographic representations of the dying Socrates.

66. The death-bed scene of Socrates is one obvious parallel.

The second section of the parable of Bathycles' cup as we have it opens with Bathycles' son sailing to Miletus (line 52), another image that contrasts with the narrator's own experience, his sailing across Acheron (line 97 κἀποπλεῖν ὥρη, [and the hour to sail away]). Imagery of sailing in the *Iambi* is polyvalent, repeatedly calling forth the composition's distance from the setting of its generic origin. Of the roughly thirteen missing lines that preceded line 52 some part may have provided more of the original choice of Thales as first recipient of the cup (cf. lines 52–53 ἦν γὰρ ἡ νίκη | Θάληϲ, ὅϲ τ' ἦν ἄλλα δεξιὸϲ γνώμην, "For the victory fell to Thales, who was of able mind in other things"). Some twenty lines following line 73, which included the end of Thales' speech, are missing from the papyrus. Four of these are preserved in other sources, of which the last three are concerned with the votive object on its return to Thales. This would suggest that Thales had by far the largest description and speaking role of the seven in the parable.[67] Callimachus' ability to compress, as in the gathering of the several gods in *Iambus* 12, need not entail that shorter passages are dismissive, but rather allows for compositional variation.

At least one other iambic poet of the same period, Phoenix of Colophon, appears to have treated the same parable.[68] The surviving lines of Phoenix' version (fr. 4 Powell) also give Thales as the final recipient of the golden drinking vessel. Whether Thales is also the initial recipient, and the tale proceeds from there as in *Iambus* 1, is unclear.[69]

Θαλῆς γάρ, ὅστις ἀστέρων . .
. . . ὀνήιστος
καὶ τῶν τότ', ὡς λέγουσι, πολλὸν ἀνθρώπων
ἐὼν ἄριστος, ἔλαβε πελλίδα χρυσῆν.

For Thales, who of stars . . .
. . . most helpful
and of those then, as they say, being best by far
of men, received the golden pail.

67. See White (1999) 8, n. 34. On Thales' configuration of the constellation the Little Dipper see G. S. Kirk, J. E. Raven, and M. Schofield, eds., *The Presocratic Philosophers* (Cambridge, 1983), 81–84. In considering Callimachus' portrayal of Thales it is worth recalling that Thales, although not alone of the sages, was thought to have journeyed to Egypt and to have acquired at least some of his knowledge there; see Kirk, Raven, and Schofield (1983) 79–80.

68. On the sequence of the two poets, see White (1999) 1, n. 2.

69. See Gerhard (1909) 194–97.

Phoenix appears to use Thales as Callimachus does the Seven Sages in *Iambus* 1, possibly with a contrast in τῶν τότ' to the contemporary world. Phoenix deploys a subtle oxymoron in πελλίδα χρυσῆν; a πελλίς is a milk-pail,[70] a simple object for this material. The word πελλίς, and the related πέλλη, although not especially common, appear twice in the extant fragments of Hipponax (13.1 W. [21 Deg.], 14.1 W. [22 Deg]); in the first of these Hipponax plays on the contrast of πελλίς (milk-pail) and κύλιξ (drinking vessel), a play Phoenix may be echoing.[71] Although the final section of *Iambus* 1 is replete with Hipponactean vocabulary, it is not clear if Callimachus uses this term, and the consequent oxymoron, of the drinking-cup in his narration of the same parable.

The poet frames the narrative of the cup's peregrination to the Seven Sages with the image of Apollo's shrine at Didyma (lines 57 and 76–77); for some supplementation of the latter passage we may rely on the Diegesis lines 18–19 ὁ] δὲ ἀνατίθη[ι] τῷ̣ [Δ]ιδυμ[εῖ | Ἀ]πόλ[λωνι δὶς λαβ]ὼν ἀριστε[ῖο]ν [And he receiving it twice as an award, dedicates it to Apollo at Didyma]. A. Cameron has suggested that the representation of Didyma in this part of the poem may be an allusion to Ptolemy II's beneficence in restoring the shrine;[72] this may well be true. In the context of this narrative, however, the double evocation of the shrine has the effect of elevating the episode to the level of divine utterance. Although the god does not himself appear in this tale of legendary mortal sages, the presence of the renewed shrine at Didyma is enough to solemnize the episode and to heighten the contrast of the "iconographized" philosopher Thales with the portrayal of the chaotic swarms of literati in contemporary Alexandria. All of the narrator's description of Thales, whether of his drawing geometrical figures in the sand (lines 57–58), of his astrological feats (53–55), or of his stroking his beard (69–71),[73] contrasts directly with the portrayal of the scholars of contemporary Alexandria, their chaotic movements (lines 26–28) and undignified physical gestures (29–30), the futility of their pursuits (especially in the case of Euhemerus, 10–11), and their preoccupation with petty quarreling.

70. Cf. Theocr. *Id.* 1.26.

71. See E. Degani, "Ipponatte e i poeti filologi," *Aevum Antiquum* 8 (1995): 109–10, White (1999) 6, n. 27.

72. Cameron (1995) 167–68.

73. Thales is characterized in the doxographical tradition as particularly a typical academic, both in his absent-mindedness and the single-mindedness of his philosophic interests. While these tales are not necessarily of great historical value, they illustrate a general development of characterization that Callimachus appears to be manipulating here.

At the end of the parable of *Iambus* 1 the golden drinking-cup stands as a votive offering in the shrine of Didymian Apollo, an emblem of scholarly selflessness. Similarly at the conclusion of the tale of Hebe's birthday fête, the gift of song outshines all others. In both poems Callimachus has used a traditional vehicle, whether an exemplum drawn from myth or wisdom literature, to admonish a contemporary audience in regard to concerns that affect his poetic perception of himself, his poetic persona, as an Alexandrian writer. In both cases there is a striking novelty in the elevation achieved by the association of the central figure of the narrative frame with the central figure of the paradigm. In the presentation of the Hipponactean voice as sage, and in the presentation of Apollo as poet, Callimachus has reinvented a figure—and both figures stand as emblematic of a reinvented genre.

FOUR

Fable

Iambi 2 and 4

The tale of Hebe's birthday fête in *Iambus* 12 and the parable of Bathycles' cup in *Iambus* 1 are, broadly defined, examples of one kind of paradigm. Both are taken from an elevated plane, whether divine / heroic or wisdom literature. Although wisdom literature is in many respects heir to a popular anecdotal tradition, Callimachus' reworking of this tradition in *Iambus* 1 appeals rather to a learned audience. Both paradigms are mythical, both are metaphors for human experience (here contests in σοφία [wisdom]). Both paradigms represent the cultural authority of archaic Greece in a later period, both define their speakers in terms of σοφία, and both enhance the stature of their respective narrators.

In his manipulation of this paradigmatic type Callimachus draws on one of the oldest conventions of Greek literature. Indeed, a large part of the effect of the two paradigms derives from the ancient, and hence authoritative and therefore validating nature of this convention. The Homeric parallels of Meleager (heroic), Niobe (divine) or even the humorous tale of Aphrodite and Ares serve as examples to inculcate certain correct behavioral norms in an epic tradition. Callimachus has turned this convention to his own ends, and appropriated the use of elevated paradigm and the anticipation of its effect on its audience to his own poetic purpose.

Fable serves a similar end for Callimachus in the *Iambi*. The nature of fable qua paradigm, however, is rather different. Fable delineates the "unreal," animals with human voice and experience.[1] Fables drawn from the animal world attract the sympathy of their audience through their homely nature.[2] Animal fable, with its illustration of the

1. See S. Jedrkiewicz, *Sapere e Paradosso nell'Antichità: Esopo e la Favola* (Rome 1989), 319–22.

2. Cf. the assessment of Vossius as paraphrased by A. Adam in the introduction to his edition of the *Fables* of La Fontaine (Paris, 1966) 12 on fable as "faite pour les en-

often harsh, even cruel realities of the natural world, and of the forces at play in this world, is on one level seemingly the simplest kind of paradigm. Widely attested in the literatures of pre-Greek civilizations, fable can be understood culturally both as demonstrative of oriental influence in the archaic Greek world,[3] and, at the same time, as indicative of the universality of certain folkloric motifs. This aspect of universality, the popular nature of animal fable, is essential to keep in mind when considering Callimachus' personal and context-specific application of this kind of narrative in his own poetry. The *Iambi* memorialize the cultural past both through collection (of earlier poets, philosophic sages, artistic monuments) and through reinvention of each category. Callimachus reinvents fable, popular narrative with universal application, as personal and self-referential statement—Aesop as an Alexandrian poet.

---

fants, pour les gens du peuple, pour les esprits sans culture." See Jedrkiewicz (1989) 11–12, 54–55.

3. See West (1978) 28–29, 204, West, *The East Face of Helicon* (Oxford, 1997), 319–20, 502–5. W. Burkert, *The Orientalizing Revolution: Near-Eastern Influence on Greek Culture in the Early Archaic Age* (Cambridge, Mass., 1992), 120–24. On the many and varied sources of fable available to the Alexandrian poet see West, "Near Eastern Material in Hellenistic and Roman Literature," *HSCP* 73 (1969): 114–20.

ʾΗν κεῖνος οὐνιαυτός, ᾧ τό τε πτηνόν
καὶ τοὺν θαλάσσῃ καὶ τὸ τετράπουν αὖτως
ἐφθέγγεθ' ὡς ὁ πηλὸς ὁ Προμήθειος
. . . . . .
τἀπὶ Κρόνου τε καὶ ἔτι τὰ πρὸ τη[
λ . . ουσα και κως [.]υ ς[.]νημεναις. [
δίκαιος ὁ [Ζε]ύς, οὐ δίκαι[α] δ᾽ αἰσυμνέ̣ων
τῶν ἑρπετῶ̣ν [μ]ὲν ἐξέκοψε τὸ φθέ̣[γμα,
γένος δὲ τ. υτ. [.]. ρον—ὥσπερ οὐ κάρτ[ος
ἡμέων ἐχόντων χἠτέροις ἀπάρξασθαι—
. . .]ψ ἐς ἀνδρῶν· καὶ κιυ̣ινὸς [μ]ὲ[ν] ιΕὔ̣δ̣ημος,
ὅ̣ινο̣υ δὲ Φίλτων, ψιττακοῦ δ̣ε̣[
οἱ δὲ τραγῳδοὶ τῶν θάλασσαν ο̣ἰ̣[κεύντων
ἔχο[υ]σι φωνήν· οἱ δὲ πάντες [ἄνθρωποι
καὶ πουλύμυθοι καὶ λάλοι πε̣φ̣[ύκασιν
ἐκεῖθεν, ὠνδρόνικε· ταῦτα δ᾽ Αι̣ΐ̣σω̣ι̣πος
ὁ Σαρδιηνὸς εἶπεν, ὅντιν᾽ οἱ Δελφοί
ἄ̣δοντα μῦθον οὐ καλῶς ἐδέξαντο.

Text: *Iambus* 2 is extant in two parts; the opening of the poem, a three-line citation preserved in the *Stromateis* of Clement of Alexandria, and the concluding fourteen lines from *P. Oxy.* 1011. There are some twenty lines missing between fr. 191.98 and fr. 192.4; three of these are the citation preserved in Clement. There is presently no way of knowing how many of the lost lines were the conclusion to *Iambus* 1 and how many belonged to *Iambus* 2. Although the last extant lines of *Iambus* 1 include what appear to be references to the speaker's return to the underworld, the poem may have continued for several lines or more.

Meter: stichic choliambic.

Dialect: literary Ionic.

4 τὰ πρὸ τη[Pfeiffer suggests τῆ[ς]δ᾽ ἀρχῆς, E. A. Barber "Notes on the Diegesis of Callimachus," *CQ* 33 (1939): 68 conjectures τῆ[ς ʾΡείης, which seems awkward in sense.

5 λ . . ουσα και κως [.]υ ς[.]νημεναις.[S. G. Kapsomenos, "Συμβολὴ εἰς τὴν ἑρμηνείαν τοῦ δευτέρου Ἰάμβου τοῦ Καλλιμάχου," *Athena* 47 (1937): 29 suggests λέγουσα καὶ κῶς [ο]ὐ ς[υ]νῆμεν αἰσχ[ύνῃ for this line, assuming the fox (Dieg. line 25 ἀλώπηξ) as the subject.

8 [.] . ρον Pfeiffer suggests [χ]ῆρον [bereft] to agree with γένος, an adjective Callimachus uses several times in his epigrams.

10 . . .]ψ At the beginning of line 10 a finite verb is needed—von Arnim suggested ἔτρε]ψ', Platt ἤμει]ψ'.

It was in that time, when the wingèd
and that which dwells in the sea, and likewise the four-footed
used to give utterance as does the Promethean clay
. . . . . .
in the time of Cronus' rule, and still before[
and [saying] how [.]υ c[.]νημεναιc. [
just is Zeus, but not justly ruling,
he cut off the voice of those which crawl,
yet the race τ. υτ. [.]. ρον—as though we had
not enough power to give the first fruits even to others—
. . .]ψ [he turned] to [the race] of men. And Eudemus has
the voice of a dog, and Philton that of an ass, and of the parrot[
and the tragedians have that of those
who dwell in the sea. And all men
are both wordy and babbling
from that time, Andronicus. These things Aesop
from Sardis said, whom the Delphians
did not receive well as he sang his tale.

VI

22 Ἦν κε[ῖν]ος οἰὐ]νιαυτός, ᾧ τό τε ⟦πτ⟧ηνόν Τἆλ-
λ̣[α] ζῷα ὠμοφώνει ἀν̣[θ]ρώποις, μέχρι
κ̣ατὰ λύσιν γήρως ἐπ[ρέ]ς̣βευσεν ὁ κύ-
25 κνος πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς καὶ ἀλώπηξ τὸν
Δία ἐτόλμησεν μὴ δικαίως ἄρχειν φά-
ναι. ἔκτοτε δὲ εἰς ἀνθρώπους μετήνεγ-
κεν αὐτῶν τὴν φωνήν, καὶ λάλοι ἐγέ-
νοντο· Εὔδημος δέ, φησίν, τὴν κυνὸς
30 ἔσχε, Φίλτων δὲ ὄνου, παρεπικόπτων
τούτους, ἴσως δὲ καὶ Σαρδιανὸν εἶπε
τὸν Αἴσωπον.

31–32 I suspect this may be a slightly mangled citation from the end of the text rather than a comment by the diegete; hence a translation is only hypothetical. Cf. Dawson (1950) 30–31, D'Alessio (1996) 591, n. 42. Maas suggested (Pfeiffer Add. et Corr. I 504) that Σαρδιανός was an alternate reading for Σαρδιηνός at line 16 of the poem: "variam lectionem marginalem ad fr. 192, 16 fuisse in exemplari diegetae, qui illam in diegesin receperit." A similar final citation is the ἐρίζεσθε at the end of the Diegesis to *Iambus* 1. ταῦτα δ' Αἰ⟦ῖ⟧σω⟦π⟧ος | ὁ Σαρδιηνὸς εἶπεν is then cited in the Diegesis ἴσως δὲ καὶ Σαρδιανὸν εἶπε | τὸν Αἴσωπον. There is then no need to attempt to deduce what the diegete may be "explaining." The syntax of the Diegesis here is, however, obscure. The papyrus text of the poem is clearly marked as ending at line 17.

"It was in that time, when the winged"
The other living creatures used to speak as do men,
until the swan went on an embassy to the gods
for the release from old age,
and the fox dared to say that Zeus did not rule justly.
Thereupon he transferred their voices to men,
and men became chatterboxes.
Eudemus, he says, had the voice of a dog,
and Philton of a donkey,
making fun of them, and [equally he spoke
<making fun of> Aesop of Sardis.]

Εἰ̣ῖc—οȷὐ γάρ;—ἡιμέȷων, παῖ Χαριτάιδεω, καὶ cύ
. [. . . .]ῴικ[.]. [. . . .] ̣̂ [
[ ]
π̣αρ̣[. . . . .]. [
ἡ μὲν. . [.]ηνέκ̣[
ἄκουιεȷ δὴ τὸν αἶνον· ἔιν κοτε Τμώλῳ
δάφνην ἐλαίῃ νεῖικοc οἱ πάλαι Λυδοί
λέγουcι θέcθαι καὶ γα[
κ̣αλόν τ̣ε̣ δένδρε̣[ον
cείcαc[α] τοὺc ὄρπηκ[αc
ο̣. [. .]cυμη. ηφῃ[
.]. . . [.]. ε . . [.] ὲ̣λ̣ουcιν̣[

[about 9 verses are missing]

. . . . . .
†ἐγὼ δὲ πάντων εἰμὶ τῶν δένδρων φαύλη†
. . . . . .
]. . [
τ̣άλαινα̣[
ἐμεῦ πα[
τῇ δ’ αὖτι[c
'ὤφρων ἐ̣[λαίη
ἐγὼ δεμ. [
ὁ̣ Δῆλον ο[ἰκέων

Text: The text of *Iambus* 4 as we now have it consists of (1) the lemma preserved in the Diegesis; (2) the fragmentary opening lines preserved in two papyri (*P. Oxy.* 1011 and *P. Oxy.* 2215); (3) the long central part of the fable (lines 22–106 of our text) from *P. Oxy.* 1011; and (4) two very fragmentary pieces at the end of the poem preserved in *PSI* 1216 and *P. Ryl.* 485.

Meter: stichic choliambic.

Dialect: literary Ionic.

1 οȷὐ γάρ Cf. *GP* 77–78. *Iambus* 1 has in its first line the particle combination ιοȷὐ γὰρ ἀλλ’. The verbal allusion may be intentional, as there are many similarities between the two poems. *Iambus* 4 is the last of the stichic choliambic poems, *Iambus* 1 is the first. There is a compositional structure of two longer stichic choliambic poems framing two markedly shorter ones.

1 καὶ cύ This is the only occurrence of a monosyllabic ending of a choliambic line in the surviving choliambs of Callimachus.

One—surely not?—of us, son of Charitades, even you
.[. . . .]ῴικ[.]. [. . . .] ̂[
[ ]
π̣αρ̣[. . . . .]. [
she . . [.]ηνέκ̣[
Indeed hear the fable. The Lydians of old
say that once on Tmolus
the laurel took up a quarrel with the olive and γα[
and a beautiful tree [
having shaken her branches [
ο̣. [. .]cυμη. ηφη̣[
.]. . . [.]. ε. . [.] ε̣λ̣ουcιν̣[

[about 9 lines are missing]

. . . . . .
of all the trees am I of little worth
. . . . . .
]. . [
wretched [
than I πα[
to her in turn[
"Foolish [olive
I δεμ. [
the one [who dwells] in Delos

13 ἐγὼ δὲ πάντων εἰμὶ τῶν δένδρων φαύλη Pfeiffer has inserted fr. 93b Schn. as line 13. The metrical restoration of this line was suggested by Headlam (and is found in the margin of his copy of Schneider's edition now in the library of King's College, Cambridge). The line is cited by one of the ancient rhetoricians as an example of ἀστεϊσμός (feigned self-modesty or self-deprecation); [Trypho] Περὶ τρόπων 24 (Spengel, *Rhet. Gr.* III p. 206, 15) ἀcτεϊσμός ἐστι λόγος ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ διασυρτικὸς γενόμενος, ὡς εἴ τις πλουτῶν λέγει, 'ἐγὼ δέ εἰμι πάντων πενέστατος' . . . παρὰ δὲ Καλλιμάχῳ ἀστεϊζομένη ἡ ἐλαία φησίν 'ἐγὼ φαύλη πάντων τῶν δένδρων εἰμί.' καλεῖται δὲ τοῦτο καὶ προσποίησις.

17 τῇ δ' αὖτι[c The particle and adverb indicate that the olive, to whom the following lines are addressed, has spoken before (hence the assignation of line 13 to its present position).

κ̣αί μευ τ[
. . . . . .
ὡριcτερὸc μὲν λευκὸc ὡc ὕδρου γαcτήρ,
ὁ δ' ἡλιοπλὴξ ὃc τὰ [π]ολλὰ γυμνοῦται.
τίc δ' οἶκοc οὗπερ [ο]ὐκ ἐγὼ παρὰ φλιῇ;
τίc δ' οὔ με μάντιc ἢ τίc οὐ θύτης ἔλκει;
καὶ Πυθίη γὰρ ἐν δάφνῃ μὲν ἵδρυται,
δάφνην δ' ἀείδει καὶ δάφνην ὑπέcτρωται.
ὤφρων ἐλαίη, τοὺc δὲ παῖδαc οὐ Βράγχοc
τοὺc τῶν Ἰώνων, οἷc ὁ Φοῖβοc ᾠ[ργίcθη,
δάφνῃ τε κρούων κἦποc οὐ τομ[ὸν λαοῖ]c
δὶc ἢ τρὶc ε[ἰ]πὼν ἀρτεμέαc ἐποίη[cε;
κ]ἠγὼ μὲν ἢ 'πὶ δαῖταc ἢ 'c χορὸν φ[οι]τέω
τὸν Πυθαϊcτήν· γίνομαι δὲ κἄεθλον·
οἱ Δωριῆc δὲ Τεμπόθεν με τέμνουcιν
ὀρέων ἀπ' ἄκρων καὶ φέρουcιν ἐc Δελφούc,
ἐπὴν τὰ τὠπόλλωνοc ἱρὰ γίνηται.
ἱρὴ γάρ εἰμι· πῆμα δ'οὐχὶ γινώcκω
οὐδ' οἶδ' ὁκ̣[οίη]ν οὐλαφηφόροc κάμπτει,
ἁιγνὴ γάρ εἰμι, κοὐ πατεῦcί μ' ἄνθρωποι,
ὤφρων ἐλαίη, cοὶ δὲ χὠπότ' ἂν νεκρόν
μέλλωcι καίειν ἢ [τά]φ[ῳ] περιcτέλλει[ν,
αὐτοί τ' ἀνecτέψ[αντο χ]ὐπὸ τὰ πλευρά
τοῦ μὴ πνέοντ[οc. . .]παξ ὑπ[έ]ç̣τ[ρωcαν.'
ἡ μὲν τᾰ́δ̣', οὐκέτ' ἄλλα· τὴν δ' ἀπήλ̣[λαξε
μάλ' ἀτρεμαίωc ἡ τεκοῦcα τὸ χρῖμ[α·
'ὦ πάντα κ̣αλή, τῶν ἐμῶν τὸ κ[άλλιcτον
ἐν τῇ τελευτῇ κύκνοc [ὡc Ἀπόλλωνοc
ἤειcαc· οὕτ̣ῳ μ̣ὴ κάμοιμ[ι ποιεῦcα.

30 τομ[ὸν λαοῖ]c The papyrus reads τομ[ ]c. Pfeiffer conjectured τομόc [keen, sharp] to be understood here almost with the sense of cαφήc. The second part of Pfeiffer's conjecture, λαοῖ]c, is more problematic. Pfeiffer is following, I think, the line of the opening of the *Iliad* 1.10 νοῦcον ἀνὰ cτρατὸν ὦρcε κακήν, ὀλέκοντο δὲ λαοί, where λαοί stands in apposition to the aggregate noun cτρατός. However, the apposition in Callimachus seems cumbersome after the extended direct object. There is no equivalent structure with this word elsewhere in Callimachus' poetry. Perhaps an adverb in -ωc? A survey of the extant lines of Callimachus' *Branchus* (fr. 229 Pf.) reveals nothing suggestive.

37 ἱρὴ γάρ εἰμι P. Maas suggested (Pfeiffer Add. et Corr. I 505) that line 37 ὤφρων ἐλαίη and line 40 ἱρὴ γάρ εἰμι be transposed, and I have followed this transposi-

and of me τ[
. . . . . .
Your left side is white like the belly of a water snake,
and the other, which is most often uncovered, sunburned.
What dwelling exists where I am not upon the threshold?
Who is the seer or sacrificer who does not carry me?
For even the Pythia sits upon laurel,
laurel does she sing and she has laurel strewn below her.
Foolish olive, did not Branchus make the sons of the Ionians,
with whom Phoebus was enraged, sound again
by striking them with laurel and saying a magic word
two or three times [to the people]?
And I go to feasts and to the dance
of the Pytho, and I am the prize.
The Dorians cut me from Tempe
from the high hills and bring me to Delphi,
whenever the holy festivals of Apollo are celebrated.
For I am holy; I do not know suffering,
nor whereto the bearer of corpses bends his way,
for I am pure, and men do not tread upon me,
foolish olive. But for you—whenever they are going
to burn a corpse or lay it out [in burial,]
they crown themselves and below the sides of him
who breathes no more they spread you about . .]παξ."
So spoke she these things, and no others more.
But she who gave birth to oil replied to the laurel very quietly.
"O fair one in all things, [as] the swan [of Apollo]
you sang the fairest of my features at the end.
May I not tire in [acting] thus.

tion in my text. Pfeiffer's comment ibid. is very convincing: "ἰρὴ γάρ εἰμι multo melius sequitur versum 36 ἵρ' ἀγινῆται quam versum 39 ἀγνὴ γάρ εἰμι; ὄφρων ἐλαίη optime cum cοὶ δὲ coniungitur, male cum πῆμα δ' οὐχὶ γινώcκω."

43 . . .]παξ No satisfactory reading has been proposed for this lacuna. Among the suggestions are εἰcάπαξ (Hunt) and ὦ πό]παξ "interiectio indignantis" Pfeiffer. An adverb seems likely.

48 οὕτῳ μὴ κάμοιμ[ι ποιεῦcα. The sense of ποιεῦcα is, as Pfeiffer notes, somewhat awkward. The phrase appears to look forward in the poem rather than to the immediate context of the laurel's preceding utterance. Something like Lobel's ἀκούουcα would fit here rather better.

ἐγὼ μὲν ἄνδρας, οὓς Ἄρης ἀπόλλυσι,
κυνέκ τε πέμπω χὐ[πὸ
. .]. ων ἀριστέων, οἳ κα. . . . . [. . .]. [. .] . ,
ἐγῶ] δὲ λευκὴν ἡνίκ' ἐς τάφον Τηθὺν
φέρο[υσι] παῖδες ἢ γέροντα Τιθωνόν,
αὐτή [θ' ὁ]μαρτέω κἠπὶ τὴν ὁδὸν κεῖμαι·
γηθέω δὲ πλεῖον ἢ σὺ τοῖς ἀγινεῦσιν
ἐκ τῶν σε Τεμπέων. ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἐμνήσθης
καὶ τοῦτο· κῶς ἄεθλον οὐκ ἐγὼ κρέσσων
σεῦ; καὶ γὰρ ὠγὼν οὐν Ὀλυμπίῃ μέζων
ἢ 'ν τοῖσι Δελφοῖς· ἀλλ' ἄριστον ἡ σωπή.
ἐγὼ μὲν οὔτε χρηστὸν οὔτε σε γρύζω
ἀπηνὲς οὐδέν· ἀλλά μοι δύ' ὄρνιθες
ἐν τοῖσι φύλλοις ταῦτα τινθυρίζουσαι
πάλαι κάθηνται· κωτίλον δὲ τὸ ζεῦγος.
τίς δ' εὗρε δάφνην; γῆ τε καὶ κα[. . .]ς[
ὡς πρῖνον, ὡς δρῦν, ὡς κύπειρον, ὡς πεύκην.
τίς δ' εὗρ' ἐλαίην; Παλλάς, ἦμος [ἤρ]ιζ[ε
τῷ φυκιοίκῳ κἠδίκαζεν ἀρχαίοις
ἀνὴρ ὅφις τὰ νέρθεν ἀμφὶ τῆς Ἀκτῆς.
ἓν ἡ δάφνη πέπτωκε. τῶν δ' ἀειζώων
τίς τὴν ἐλαίην, τίς δὲ [τ]ὴν δάφνην τιμᾷ;
δάφνην Ἀπόλλων, ἡ δὲ Παλλὰς ἣν εὗρε.
ξυνὸν τόδ' αὐταῖς, θεοὺς γὰρ οὐ διακρίνω.
τί τῆς δάφνης ὁ καρπός; ἐς τί χρήσωμαι;
μήτ' ἔσθε μήτε πῖνε μήτ' ἐπιχρίσῃ.
ὁ τῆς δ' ἐλαίης ἓν μὲν †αλιτιτω† μάσταξ
ὃ στ[έμφυλο]ν καλεῦσιν, ἓν δὲ τὸ χρῖμα,
ἓν [δ' ἡ κολ]υμβὰς ἣν ἔπωνε χὠ Θησεύς·
τ[ὸ δ]εύ[τερ]ον τίθημι τῇ δάφνῃ πτῶμα.
τεῦ γὰρ [τὸ] φύλλον οἱ ἱκέται προτείνουσι ;
τὸ τῆς ἐλαίης· τὰ τρί' ἡ δάφνη κεῖται.

64 γῆ τε καὶ κα[. . .]ς[This should be a standard idiom. However nothing really convincing has been proposed.

74 μήτ' ἔσθε μήτε πῖνε μήτ' ἐπιχρίσῃ. Cf. Aesch. *Prom.* 478–81 τὸ μὲν μέγιστον, εἴ τις ἐς νόσον πέσοι, | οὐκ ἦν ἀλέξημ' οὐδέν, οὔτε βρώσιμον | οὐ χριστὸν οὐδὲ πιστόν, ἀλλὰ φαρμάκων | χρείαι κατεσκέλλοντο, Eur. *Hipp.* 515 πότερα δὲ χριστὸν ἢ ποτὸν τὸ φάρμακον; The laurel's apotropaic qualities appear in the first line of Theocr. *Id.* 2, where Simaetha requests her maid to bring laurel for the spell she is about to cast;

For both do I escort the men, whom Ares [slays,]
together and below(?)
. .]. ω̣ν of the noblest, who κα. . . . . [. . .]. [. .]. ,
and [I] when their children bear to the grave
a white-haired Tethys, or aged Tithonus,
do myself accompany them and lie upon the way.
In them do I take greater joy than you
in those who bring you from Tempe. But since you mentioned
this as well—how am I not a prize of greater worth
than you? For the contest in Olympia is greater
than that in Delphi. But silence is best.
For in your case I mutter nothing good
nor harsh. But two birds
sit long among my leaves twittering
these things, and this pair is a chattering one.
'Who discovered the laurel?' 'Earth and κ̣α[. . .]ς̣[
like the ilex, like the oak, like the galingale, like the pine.'
'But who discovered the olive?' 'Pallas, when she competed
with the sea-weed dweller, and a man, snake below,
was giving judgments to the men of old around Acte.'
'Once has the laurel fallen. And of those who live forever
who honors the olive, and who the laurel?'
'The laurel Apollo, and Pallas the one she discovered.
In this they are equal, for I do not distinguish between gods.'
'What is the fruit of the laurel? To what end am I to use it?'
'Neither eat nor drink of it nor rub it on.
That of the olive is at once the morsel †αλι̣τ̣ιτω†
which they call [olive-cake], and at once olive-oil,
and at once the pickled olive that even Theseus drank down.'
'This I count a second fall for the laurel.
Whose leaf do suppliants hold before them?'
'That of the olive.' 'The laurel lies fallen for the third time.'

see Gow's comment vol. 2 p. 36. The laurel also appears in this light in a papyrus fragment of Sophron (*PCG* 4).

75 †αλι̣τ̣ιτω† The editors are surely correct, following the sense of the passage, in suggesting that this must be some fairly humble figure. Lobel suggested either *pauperis* or *agricolae*, Pfeiffer suggests also that food for birds might be meant, and gives several parallel citations.

(φεῦ τῶν ἀτρύτων, οἷα κωτιλίζουcι·
λαιδρὴ κορώνη, κῶc τὸ χεῖλοc οὐκ ἀλγεῖc ;)
τεῦ γ]ὰρ τὸ πρέμνον Δήλιοι φυλάccουcι ;
τὸ τ]ῆc ἐλαίηc ἢ ἀν[έπαυc]ε τὴν Λητώ.
. . . . .]οι πολῖται κ̣[ ]τ̣ι τῷ̣ δήμῳ
]. τανουν ἔcτεφέ̣ν̣ μιν ἡ δάφνη
]α θαλλῷ̣ καλλίνικοc ἡλαίη
]υ̣φανητε κ̣ὴπὶ τὴν ὄγχνην
]. τερην τιν' αἰνεῖται
]. ικουτε̣κ̣οι μ̣ά̣ντειc
]ν οὔτ' ἐπὶ φλιῆc
]. [φ]ημι τὴν δάφνην.'
ὣc εἶπε· τῇ δ' ὁ θυμὸc ἀμφὶ τῇ ῥήcει
ἤλγηcε, μέζων δ' ἢ τὸ πρόcθεν ἠγέ̣[ρ]θ̣η
τ]ὰ̣ δεύτερ' ἐc̣ τὸ νεῖκοc, ἔc̣τε τ̣ιν. [
βάτοc τὸ τρηχὺ τειχέων π̣. . δ. [.]υ̣α
ἔλεξεν (ἦν γὰρ οὐκ ἄπωθε τῶν δενδρέων)·
'οὐκ ὦ τάλαιναι παυcόμεcθα, μὴ χ̣α̣ρ̣τ̣αί
γενώμεθ' ἐχθροῖc, μηδ' ἐροῦμεν ἀλλήλαc
ἄνολβ' ἀναιδέωc, ἀλλὰ ταῦτά γ'. β. . μ. ;'
τὴν δ' ἆρ' ὑποδρὰξ οἷα ταῦροc ἡ δάφνη
ἔβλεψε καὶ τάδ' εἶπεν· 'ὦ κακὴ λώβη,
ὡc δὴ μί' ἡμέων καὶ cύ; μή με ποιήcαι
Ζεὺc τοῦτο· καὶ γὰρ γειτονεῦc' ἀποπνίγειc
]. c οὐ μὰ Φοῖβον, οὐ μὰ δέcποιναν,
τῇ̣ κ]ύμβαλοι̣ ψοθεῦcιν, οὐ μὰ Πακτ[ωλόν
. . . . . .

[an uncertain number of lines are missing]

96 π̣ . . δ.[.]υ̣α A locative expression taking the genitive with τειχέων is needed. Pfeiffer conjectured περίφραγμα [enclosure], P. Maas *Stud. it.* 11 (1934): 97 προcίδρυμα [found near to].

100 γ'. β. . μ. ; G. M. Lee, "Callimachus, Iambus IV, fr. 194, 100 (Pfeiffer)," *CQ*, n.s., 27 (1977): 237 suggested ὕβριcμα here which was queried by the editors, ibid. 238. Aside from a certain resulting awkward apposition, the adversative sense of the ἀλλά would then be lost.

(Alas for the untiring ones. How they chatter.
Foolish crow, how is it your lip does not pain you?)
'For whose trunk do the Delians guard?
That of the olive, which [gave rest] to Leto.
. . . . .]οι citizens κ̣[ ]τ̣ι for the people
]. τανουν the laurel crowned it
]α with her shoot the olive fair in victory
] do you reveal(?) even to the pear tree
] . τερην praises someone
]. ικουτεκ̣οι seers
]ν nor upon the threshold
]. [ ] I assert the laurel."
So she spoke. But the heart of the other was grieved
at this speech, and she was aroused more than before
for a second quarrel, until τ̣ιν. [
a rough bramble the walls π̣. . δ. [.]υ̣α
spoke (for she was not far from the trees);
"Miserable ones, will we not cease, lest we become
objects of fun to our enemies, nor let us say unhappy things
shamelessly of one another, but these γ'. β̣. . . μ̣. ?"
The laurel looked at her from under her brow like a bull
and said the following. "O evil source of disgrace,
so even you are one of us? Zeus, don't do this to me!
For you give me the creeps just by being my neighbor.
]. c no by Phoebus, no by our lady,
for whom the cymbals clash, no by Pactolus
. . . . . .

[an uncertain number of lines are missing]

]ας ἀλλήλους
]δρήστης
]. ἔστηκεν
]ἥδιστος·
πε]ποιήσθω·
]μη χείρων
]ο̣λ̣π̣ηι·
. . . .].
.ηρ. [ ].
τοδ. [ ]ν̣·
ἔχε̣ι̣[ ]

117 Pfeiffer ad loc.: "duae lineae in marg. dextr. (*PSI*) finem et huius iambi et totius partis iambicos trimetros claudos continentis indicare videntur; in marg. sin. (*P. Ryl.*) coronis." From a photograph of *PSI* 1216 it is clear that there is insufficient space for more lines of this *Iambus* to follow before *Iambus* 5.

]αc one another
] laborer
] has set up
] sweetest.
] let it have been made.
] not (?) worse
]ο̣λπ̣ηι
. . . .].
.ηρ. [ ].
τοδ. [ ]ν̣·
ἔχε̣ι̣[ ]

VII

Εἶc—οὐ γάρ ;—ἡμέων παῖ Χαριτάδεω καὶ cύ
Διεφέρετο ὁ ποιητὴc πρόc τινα τῶν ἐφα-
μίλλων· Cῖμοc δέ τιc παρατυχὼν παρυπέ-
κρουεν ἄμφω παρενδεικνύμενοc ἴcοc εἶ-
ναι. Θρᾷκα δέ φηcιν αὐτὸν καθεcτά-
ναι ⟨—⟩παιδοκλέπτηc ἐcτί. καὶ γὰρ τὸν
αἶνον παρατίθεται ἀκόλουθον, ὡc ἐν Τμώ-
λῳ ⟨δάφνη καὶ⟩ ἐλαία διεφέροντο ὑπὲρ πρωτείων
(παρεπεφύκεcαν δ' ἀλλήλαιc), διεξῄε-
cαν δὲ τὰ προcόντα ἑαυταῖc χρήcιμα.
ἐπὶ πλεῖον δὲ διαφερομένων ὑπο-
τυχοῦcα βάτοc παλαιά· 'πέπαυθε
πρὶν εἰ μὴ ἐ[π]ίχαρτοι ⟨τοῖ⟩c δυc[μ]ενέcι γε-
νώμεθα' (π[αρ]επεφύκ[ει δ' αὐ]τ̣αιc).
πρ]ὸc ἦν ἀποβλέψαcα [. . . . .] ἡ δά-
φν]η 'ὦ κακὴ λώβη,' φη[cίν], ι'ὡc δὴ μ̣ί' ἡ-
μέ̣ων καὶ cι̣ύ;. . .]cεικο[. . . . .]c̣υε
. .]ινητ̣[. . .]α̣τωδ̣ρα[. . . . .]ειcειc

5–6 Θρᾷκα δέ φηcιν αὐτὸν καθεcτά | ναι ⟨—⟩παιδοκλέπτηc ἐστί. The editors of the text suggest an explanatory conjunction for the lacuna, e.g. ὅτι (Norsa and Vitelli), ἐπειδή (Pohlenz)

"One—surely not?—of us, son of Charitades, even you"
The poet was arguing with one of his rivals.
And some snub-nosed type happening by interrupted both
to demonstrate that he was their equal.
He says that he is a Thracian
(because?) he is a boy-thief; and he
adds the following fable, how on Tmolus
a laurel and an olive differed over which was better
(they grew next to one another);
they were going through the list of the virtues of each.
An aged bramble which happened to be near
these two quarreling even more [said] "cease
before we become objects of fun for our enemies"
(for it grew next to them).
Looking at her [. . . . .] the laurel
said "O evil source of disgrace, so you too
are one of us? . . .]cεικο[. . . . .]ϙυε
. .]ινητ̣[. . .]α̣τωδ̣ρα[. . . . .]εικειc

Interpretation

Fable in Archaic Greek Poetry

The earliest occurrence of animal fable in Greek poetry is the fable of the hawk and the nightingale in Hesiod's *Works and Days* (lines 202–12). Hesiod has a central role in Callimachean poetics, and for this reason I begin with Hesiod's narrative in briefly outlining the background of animal fable in archaic poetry that serves Callimachus both as model and point of departure.

Νῦν δ' αἶνον βασιλεῦσιν ἐρέω, φρονέουσι καὶ αὐτοῖς.
ὧδ' ἴρηξ προσέειπεν ἀηδόνα ποικιλόδειρον,
ὕψι μάλ' ἐν νεφέεσσι φέρων, ὀνύχεσσι μεμαρπώς·
ἡ δ' ἐλεόν, γναμπτοῖσι πεπαρμένη ἀμφ' ὀνύχεσσι
μύρετο· τὴν δ' ὅ γ' ἐπικρατέως πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπεν·
"δαιμονίη, τί λέληκας; ἔχει νύ σε πολλὸν ἀρείων·
τῇ δ' εἶς ἥ σ' ἂν ἐγώ περ ἄγω καὶ ἀοιδὸν ἐοῦσαν·
δεῖπνον δ', αἴ κ' ἐθέλω, ποιήσομαι ἠὲ μεθήσω.
ἄφρων δ', ὅς κ' ἐθέλῃ πρὸς κρείσσονας ἀντιφερίζειν.
νίκης τε στέρεται πρός τ' αἴσχεσιν ἄλγεα πάσχει."
ὣς ἔφατ' ὠκυπέτης ἴρηξ, τανυσίπτερος ὄρνις.

Now will I tell a fable to kings, and they being of sound mind.
Thus did a hawk speak to a nightingale of many-hued neck,
bearing it on high among the clouds, having caught it up in its talons.
And the nightingale, pierced through by the curved talons around it,
wept piteously. To her the hawk spoke masterfully a word;
"Luckless one, why have you cried out? One far stronger now holds you.
You go there wherever I take you, though being a singer.
I will make you my dinner if I wish, or let you go.
Foolish is he who seeks to contend with those more powerful.
He is deprived of victory and suffers pains in addition to disgrace."
So spoke the swift-winged hawk, bird of long wings.

Hesiod narrates this fable in the course of his own direct personal admonition.[4] The poet frames his narrative in a manner typical of ring-composition, marking off the fable as a separate entity from its narrative setting. He introduces the fable as a paradigm to the kings.[5] The first person address to the kings Νῦν δ' αἶνον βασιλεῦσιν ἐρέω (line 202) and the imperative to Perses at line 213 Ὦ Πέρση, σὺ δ' ἄκουε δίκης, μηδ' ὕβριν ὄφελλε frame the paradigm. While the poet's voice might

4. On the use of fable in earlier Greek literature, see West (1978) 204.
5. Not, as West (1978) 204 notes, the most effective one.

be said to move from a more general direction in addressing the kings in the opening frame, to a more specific one in his address to his brother[6] in the closing frame, the fable is still clearly demarcated from the rest of the poem, even if the poem's audience understands the nightingale as a metaphor for the poet.[7] Callimachus' use of animal paradigm is in this respect strikingly innovative; the human figures of the surrounding frame are incorporated into the fable.

Animal fable occurs in the archaic iambic tradition, particularly in Archilochus. Among his epodic fragments (frr. 172–81 W.)[8] are parts of the fable of the fox and the eagle that also survives in a version attributed to Aesop. The fable in the Aesopic collection illustrates the penalties of false friendship and perjury.[9] Archilochus uses the fable as an admonitory example to Lycambes on going back on his word (fr. 172 W.); the fox's outrage reflects the poet's own.[10] The poet appears from the extant fragments to frame the fable, as does Hesiod. This narrative convention of introduction also achieves an effect of distancing the fable's citation from its narrative surrounding. Part of the poet's introduction of the fable has survived:

αἶνός τις ἀνθρώπων ὅδε,
ὡς ἆρ' ἀλώπηξ καὶετὸς ξυνεωνίην
ἔμειξαν,
Archil. fr. 174 W.

There is a story told among men as follows,
how a fox and an eagle once joined
in association,

The introduction demarcates the animal characters of the fable from the people who relate it, though the animals are anthropomorphized, and indeed hellenized. The same demarcation is present in the fox's prayer to Zeus (fr. 177 W.):

ὦ Ζεῦ, πάτερ Ζεῦ, σὸν μὲν οὐρανοῦ κράτος,
σὺ δ' ἔργ' ἐπ' ἀνθρώπων ὁρᾶις

6. See M. Griffith, "Personality in Hesiod," *CA* 2, 1 (1983): 58–60. On the ambiguity of fable's relation to its audience see Jedrkiewicz (1989) 309–12.

7. As M. Griffith has suggested to me.

8. See West (1974) 132–34, M. Treu, *Archilochus* (1959) 230–36, Lasserre, *Les épodes d'Archiloque* 28–52, W. Bühler, "Archilochos und Kallimachos," *Entretiens Hardt* 10, 223–47.

9. ὁ λόγος δηλοῖ, ὅτι οἱ φιλίαν παρασπονδοῦντες, κἂν τὴν τῶν ἠδικημένων ἐκφύγωσι κόλασιν, ἀλλ' οὖν γε τήν ἐκ θεοῦ τιμωρίαν οὐ διακρούονται. (1 Haus.=1 Perry).

10. B. Gentili, *Poetry and Its Public in Ancient Greece* (Baltimore, 1988), 187, 190–91, Jedrkiewicz (1989) 313.

λεωργὰ καὶ θεμιστά, σοὶ δὲ θηρίων
ὕβρις τε καὶ δίκη μέλει.

O Zeus, father Zeus, yours is the power of heaven,
you look upon the works of men,
the wicked and the righteous, and to you
are the violence and justice of beasts a care.

The juxtaposition of human and animal figures maintains the demarcation, although a certain permeability occurs with granting human institutions[11] to animals and the inclusion of human works in the fox's prayer. This permeability in some sense prefigures Callimachus' manipulation of the boundaries of fable and surrounding poetic narrative. In the fragment of the fox's prayer Archilochus draws a bond between the world of the poetic frame and the world of the paradigmatic fable. This bond inherently exists in the use of the fable as a moral example for the human world, but is drawn closer through the inclusion of humans and their works within the context of anthropomorphized animals. The Archilochus fragment suggests an archaic narrative antecedent to Callimachus' more direct style of incorporation.

In the tradition of iambic poetry there already existed a place for animal fable and the possibility of drawing not only the lesson of animal fable but some of the features of the fable to the attention of someone portrayed as an ethical opponent. There existed also the life-story of Aesop himself as a source for moral edification.

Whether by the fifth century there was already a written tradition of the fables in the Aesopic collection, or whether they were part of an oral folk tradition that was readily available to the Greek audience, is still debated. At the center of this controversy are the frequent citations of Aesop in Aristophanes.[12] It is, however, certain that the fables of the

11. All of the Aesopic versions say only of the fox's prayer τῷ ἐχθρῷ (or τὸν ἐχθρὸν) κατηρᾶτο.

12. Especially at issue is the phrase οὐδ' Αἴσωπον πεπάτηκας, lit. "you have not trodden Aesop," from Ar. *Birds* 471. The context is, typically, one of animals and human institutions:

Χο. τουτὶ μὰ Δί' οὐκ ἐπεπύσμην.
Πε. ἀμαθὴς γὰρ ἔφυς κοὐ πολυπράγμων, οὐδ' Αἴσωπον πεπάτηκας,
ὃς ἔφασκε λέγων κορυδὸν πάντων πρώτην ὄρνιθα γενέσθαι,
προτέραν τῆς γῆς, κἄπειτα νόσῳ τὸν πατέρ' αὐτῆς ἀποθνῄσκειν·
γῆν δ'οὐκ εἶναι, τὸν δὲ προκεῖσθαι πεμπταῖον· τὴν δ' ἀποροῦσαν
ὑπ' ἀμηχανίας τὸν πατέρ' αὐτῆς ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ κατορύξαι.

Ar. *Birds* 470–75

Χο. That, by Zeus I didn't know.
Pe. For you are born ignorant and uncurious, and have not trod your Aesop,

Aesopic collection, and the figure of Aesop himself, were familiar to both the archaic iambic poets and the comic poets of the classical period. Thus Aesop, like Hipponax, is part of the traditional material of iambic verse. Aesop is another voice of the authoritative cultural past that Callimachus memorializes in the *Iambi*.

Fable in Callimachus

Callimachus would certainly have known the edition of fables attributed to Aesop that the Peripatetic philosopher Demetrius of Phalerum compiled in the early Ptolemaic period. Demetrius resided in Alexandria following his expulsion from Athens in 307, and he enjoyed the patronage of the first two Ptolemies until his fall from favor early in the reign of Ptolemy II. His collection, like the compilations of sayings of the Seven Sages, sought to collect and to codify the wisdom of the archaic period. Several aspects of Aesop, the figure of a former slave from a distant time and place, would especially appeal to the author of the *Iambi*. In a tradition of metanastic, or itinerant, sages[13] Aesop stands out as a former slave,[14] for his use of animal fable,[15] and for his punishment at the hands of the Delphians,[16] his real or imaginary critics. These are characteristics of the variegated poetic personae of the *Iambi*. The poetic voice presents himself now as metanastic (*Iambus* 1), now without material means but virtuous (*Iambus* 3), now ill received by his critics (*Iambi* 1 and 13). There are, of course, other models, particularly Hipponax, who fit a similar delineation. Aesop, however, has certain features that make him an especially attractive model. He is not

---

> who spoke saying that the crested lark was born the first bird of all,
> before the earth, and then her father died from a sickness.
> But there was no earth, and he was lain out for four days. At a loss
> she buried her father, for lack of anywhere else, in her head.

The verb πατέω is inconclusive, in spite of all efforts to extract such a meaning here as "thumbed" (LSJ s.v. πατέω II.2); see Jedrkiewicz (1989) 67, n. 108, N. Dunbar, ed., *Aristophanes:* Birds (Oxford, 1995), 325–26. Callimachus uses πατέω, following a Pindaric metaphor, of poetic direction at *Aetia* fr. 1.25–26 πρὸς δέ σε] καὶ τόδ' ἄνωγα, τὰ μὴ πατέουσιν ἅμαξαι | τὰ στείβειν [and this too I bid you, to walk where carriages do not tread], where the poetic metaphor is one borrowed from an oral poetic tradition for a written one.

13. The term is R. Martin's (1992) 14; see also Nagy (1979) 315–16. On Aesop as a sage see Jedrkiewicz (1989) 65–68, 108–56, passim.

14. On Aesop as a marginal societal figure see Jedrkiewicz (1989) 69–82.

15. On Aesop as εὑρετής [inventor] of animal fable see Jedrkiewicz (1989) 48–68 passim.

16. See Jedrkiewicz (1989) 83–88, 94–107.

a poet,[17] and hence as an utterer of simple tales lies outside of more narrow issues of poetic generic boundaries. An allusion to Aesop is at the same time an allusion to the "historical figure," utterer of wisdom, and to the source of these fables. Such an allusion sets its speaker in both traditions at once, and so may have a doubly valorizing effect. In these respects Callimachus' adaptation of the figure of Aesop, and of the Aesopic fables, does not surprise us. The cultural past valorizes the later artist who adapts it.

What is surprising and truly novel is that Callimachus appropriates fable for a contemporary "philological" setting and contemporary literary-critical purpose. In this respect Callimachus does for fable on a smaller scale what he does in many aspects for the iambic tradition as a whole, with the same effects of changed level and tone. An animal fable as poetic commentary, as iambic poetry, as literary-artistic criticism, is an Alexandrian, and particularly Callimachean, rendition of the original.

The first occasion in the collection *Aetia-Iambi* when the poet uses Aesopic fable in this way is a crucial moment of the *Aetia* prologue (fr. 1 Pf.). The passage is metaphorical and works on several levels. The poet himself is the cicada and his opponent the braying ass. Here in the center of his programmatic statement, the poet draws on the traditional image of the poet as inspired cicada, which would be familiar to his audience from a host of earlier literature (e.g. Pl. *Ion* 534b). The poet's wish is in effect a self-defining statement that places him in a venerable tradition of divinely inspired singers. Nor is the characterization of the poet's opponents as sources of cacophony unknown to the same tradition; so Pindar is thought by the ancient commentators to have characterized Bacchylides and Simonides as crows (*O.* 2.87–88).

At the same time, this passage of the *Aetia* prologue is a reworking of one of the Aesopic fables (195 Haus. = 184 Perry). The fable itself is, typically of animal fable, simple, straightforward, and rather harsh.

> ὄνος ἀκούcας τεττίγων ᾀδόντων ἥσθη ἐπὶ τῇ εὐφωνίᾳ καὶ ζηλώσας αὐτῶν τὴν ἡδύτητα εἶπε· "τί σιτούμενοι τοι αὐτην φωνὴν ἀφίετε;" τῶν δὲ εἰπόντων "δρόσον" ὁ ὄνος προσπαραμένων τῇ δρόσῳ λιμῷ διεφθάρη. οὕτως οἱ τῶν παρὰ φύσιν ἐπιθυμοῦντες πρὸς τῷ μὴ ἐπιτυχεῖν, ὧν ἐφίενται, καὶ τά μέγιστα δυστυχοῦσιν.
>
> A donkey upon hearing the cicadas sing was pleased with their harmony and envying them their sweetness of voice said: "On what do you feed that you let forth such a sound?" and on their responding "on dew" the donkey by subsisting only on dew perished of hunger.

17. On Aesop as λογοποιός [composer of fables] see Jedrkiewicz (1989) 52.

So those desiring what goes against their nature in addition to failing to get what they desire, also suffer the worst calamities.

In the *Aetia* prologue, which Callimachus produces under the *prophasis* of responding to his critics, who are already portrayed in terms of the unattractive sounds they produce (line 1 ἐπιτρύζουcιν), Callimachus evokes both elevated literature (Pindar) and rather humble utterance (Aesop)—not only in the same passage, but in fact together, through the same language and imagery. The result is a qualitative metathesis. The poet raises the stature of the animal fable by the association with the tone and imagery of elevated poetry and through deploying fable as a medium for literary criticism. I would underline another point in assessing these lines—this passage is not in an iambic poem, but at the opening of Callimachus' long elegiac poem composed deliberately and self-consciously with Hesiod in mind both as a figure and as a poetic model. In Callimachus' verse both fable and the figure of Aesop himself transcend generic boundaries. The same lines that include the dialogue of the poet and Apollo, which are followed by the poet's dream of his own transference to Helicon and the font of Hesiodic poetics, include the humbler Aesop and his animal fable.

Iambus 2

THE FABLE

Of *Iambus* 2 we have the opening lines and the conclusion. The diegete sheds some light on the content of the missing portion. It is nonetheless the case that, even with the addition of lost lines (at most seventeen), at a total of about thirty-four verses this is one of the shorter poems in the collection, as is *Iambus* 3. (*Iambi* 8–11 are obviously difficult to assess in this regard. I would, however, call attention to the length of the diegete's summary to three of these.) *Iambus* 3 is something of a personalized *paroimia,* or proverbial comparison, *Iambus* 2 a personalized fable. The two poems share several other features; they are stylistically simpler than some of the longer *Iambi.* The length of *Iambus* 2 should not diminish an appreciation of Callimachus' achievement. While imitating something of the simplicity and direct narrative style of fable, he both incorporates fable into the realm of literary criticism and, most surprisingly, his fellow writers into the realm of fable.

Scholarship on this poem has generally been of two kinds: (1) at-

tempted reconstructions of the lost earlier part of the fable,[18] and (2) readings of the existing section that seek to derive a more specific polemical message from these lines and to place them in the larger realm of Callimachean polemic.[19] Both interpretive directions have in large part overlooked the innovative quality of the poem and its place in the *Iambi*. My discussion of the poem in the following pages focuses in large part on these two points.

The opening lines of the poem are something of a scholarly play. Callimachus combines two generically quite unlikely phenomena, the traditional language of the opening of a fictional narrative[20] and descriptive vocabulary in the first two lines of the animal world drawn, not from the language of fable, but rather from the language of the zoological writers. τὸ πτηνόν (line 1) and τὸ τετράπουν (line 2) are taxonomic definitions that have equivalents not in Aesop but in, for example, Aristotle's *De generatione animalium*: τὰ μὴ πτητικά, those that do not fly (749b12–13), τὰ πτητικά, those that fly (749b11–19), τὰ τετράποδα, four-footed animals (719b22–23). Line 2, τὸ ἐν θαλάccῃ, a phrase while somewhat ambiguous and the source of some interpretive difficulty, is clearly also a descriptive definition of the same type. In the opening of the poem Callimachus subtly introduces a juxtaposition of Aesopic fable and scholarly Alexandria, a juxtaposition he so surprisingly integrates in the final etiological lines of the poem.[21] Throughout the extant poem there is a constant development of deliberate anachronism, an anachronism crowned with the introduction

18. See A. Hausrath "Ζεὺς καὶ τὰ θηρία: Die unbekannte Äsopfabel im Iambenbuch des Kallimachos (fr. 87 Schn. u. fr. 9, 160–173 Pf.)" *Gymnasium* 56 (1949): 48–58. Hausrath attempts to reconstruct the missing part of *Iambus* 2 in part through using Babrius (first or second century C.E) Prol. 1.6–13 and in part through a reading of several other animal fables in the Aesopic collection. Hausrath's method is not free from risk, as Pfeiffer observes (Add. et Corr. II 117). Stylistically the Babrius passage is very unlike the extant lines of Callimachus, and even if dependent (as Hausrath believes) on the Callimachean poem as an original, it may well be an expansion.

19. See C. Corbato, "La funzione delle 'fabulae' in Callimaco," in Ceresa-Gastaldo *La struttura della fabulazione antica* (Pubblicazioni dell'Istituto di Filologia Classica dell' Università di Genova) 54 (1979): 45–64.

20. On these lines see Corbato (1979) 49:"è il punto di partenza di una fiaba metamorfica che potremmo chiamare con Lévi-Strauss e Propp stesso 'artificiale', la quale presenta una sequenza molto semplice di 'funzioni' e sensibile omogeneità di struttura rispetto a questo tipo di invenzione."

21. Clayman (1980) 17, n. 17 remarks on the provenance of the terminology in the opening lines: "Classification of animals by their means of locomotion is standard procedure throughout fifth century literature, and afterwards in Plato (*Phd.* 250E; *Symp.* 207A) and Aristotle (*PA* 697b23; *HA* 488A). Callimachus manages to vary these expressions by using a prepositional phrase to describe the central group, and adjectives for the first and third."

of the "transferred" Aesop, who, like the Hipponactean figure of the first *Iambus,* is brought into the world of third-century Alexandria and the critical interchanges of its literary figures.

The verb of speech Callimachus deploys here of the animals itself evokes a similar juxtaposition. Line 3 ἐφθέγγεθ' is a verb that Callimachus uses generally in the context of the divine or oracular; there is an ironical positioning here in his choice of this term to represent animal "speech."

The poet contrasts the scientific descriptions of creatures in the first two lines with the rather elevated periphrasis ὁ πηλὸς ὁ Προμήθειος [the Promethean clay] (line 3). This phrase not only contrasts stylistically with his choice of expressions for the animals, but is also possibly a clever allusion to the original fable, or fable tradition, of which a Byzantine version[22] (228 Haus. = 240 Perry) survives in the Aesopic collection:

> Προμηθεὺς κατὰ πρόσταξιν Διὸς ἀνθρώπους ἔπλασε καὶ θηρία. ὁ δὲ Ζεὺς θεασάμενος πολλῷ πλείονα τὰ ἄλογα ζῷα ἐκέλευσεν αὐτὸν τῶν θηρίων τινὰ διαφθείραντα ἀνθρώπους μετατυπῶσαι. τοῦ δὲ τὸ προσταχθὲν ποιήσαντος συνέβη τοὺς ἐκ τούτων πλασθέντας τὴν μὲν μορφὴν ἀνθρώπων ἔχειν, τὰς δὲ ψυχὰς θηριώδεις.
>
> πρὸς ἄνδρα σκαιὸν καὶ θηριώδη ὁ λόγος εὔκαιρος.
>
> Prometheus at the bidding of Zeus molded humans and beasts. And Zeus, having observed that there were far more irrational animals bade him destroy some of the beasts and refashion them as humans. Prometheus did as he was ordered, and the result was that the people so refashioned had the form of humans, but the souls of beasts.
>
> This is an appropriate adage for a gauche and feral man.

Whatever form the fable took originally, two elements of this late version are especially suggestive for an analysis of *Iambus* 2. The first is the image of Prometheus and the "molding" of humans and animals—the phrase in the third line of Callimachus' poem, ὁ πηλὸς ὁ Προμήθειος, takes on a more significant cast when read against the imagery of the Byzantine version. Such an oblique allusion to an earlier version of a narrative is a particularly Callimachean technique.[23] Secondly, the refashioned people in the Byzantine version have the souls of animals, a parallel to the men of Callimachus' poem who end up making the sounds of animals, voices that by metonymy may figure as the external sign of their interior selves.[24]

22. On the Byzantine date of this version see Hausrath (1949) 50.

23. Cf. *Hymn* 6.8–17.

24. Semonides fr. 7 W. is another version of this tradition—characters of animals in human form.

The application of the ethical precepts of animal fable to the human world is an inherent characteristic of fable. In particular this was the purpose to which fables were put in the education of young children.[25] The education of young children and imagery of education are recurrent motifs in the *Iambi*: for example, *Iambus* 1.88 μαν]θάνοντες οὐδ' ἄλφα, 3.30 ἐπαιδεύθην, 5.3 ἐπεί σε δαίμων ἄλφα βῆτ[α and Diegesis, and *Iambus* 12. The innovative quality of Callimachus' treatment in *Iambus* 2 lies in the elevation of animal fable to the world of literary criticism, and more broadly to the world of scholarly discourse. This elevation begins already in the opening lines of the poem, both with the unexpectedly scientific language and with the contraposition of this language with the allusion to an original version or tradition.

Some twenty lines are missing between *Iambus* 1.98 and *Iambus* 2.4. It is not possible to discern exactly how many of these were part of *Iambus* 2. It is, however, possible to deduce from the Diegesis that some part of the missing first section included an animal embassy to the gods. In a brief note L. Früchtel observed[26] that this same fable appears in Philo of Alexandria's *De confusione linguarum* 6–8, a passage that is almost certainly drawn from Callimachus' *Iambus* 2. I give the full text with translation below—several words and phrases that are pertinent to the following discussion of *Iambus* 2 are set in bold type.

ἕτερος δέ τις συγγενὴς τούτῳ περὶ τῆς τῶν ζῴων ὁμοφωνίας πρὸς μυθοπλαστῶν ἀναγράφεται· λέγεται γάρ, ὡς ἄρα πάνθ' ὅσα ζῷα **χερσαῖα καὶ ἔνυδρα καὶ πτηνὰ** τὸ παλαιὸν ὁμόφωνα ἦν, καὶ ὅνπερ τρόπον ἀνθρώπων Ἕλληνες μὲν Ἕλλησι, βαρβάροις δὲ βάρβαροι νῦν οἱ ὁμόγλωττοι διαλέγονται, τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον καὶ πάντα πᾶσι περὶ ὧν ἢ δρᾶν ἢ πάσχειν τι συνέβαινεν ὡμίλει, ὡς καὶ ἐπὶ ταῖς κακοπραγίαις συνάχθεσθαι κἄν, εἴ πού τι λυσιτελὲς ἀπαντῴη, συνευφραίνεσθαι. τάς τε γὰρ ἡδονὰς καὶ ἀηδίας ἀλλήλοις ἀναφέροντα διὰ τοῦ ὁμοφώνου συνήδετο καὶ συναηδίζετο, κἀκ τούτου τὸ ὁμοιότροπον καὶ ὁμοιοπαθὲς εὑρίσκετο, μέχριπερ κορεσθέντα τῆς τῶν παρόντων ἀγαθῶν ἀφθονίας, ὃ πολλάκις γίνεσθαι φιλεῖ, πρὸς τὸν τῶν ἀνεφίκτων ἔρωτα ἐξώκειλε καὶ περὶ ἀθανασίας **ἐπρεσβεύετο γήρως ἔκλυσιν** καὶ τὴν εἰς αἰεὶ νεότητος ἀκμὴν αἰτούμενα, φάσκοντα καὶ τῶν παρ' αὐτοις ἓν ἤδη ζῴων **τὸ ἑρπετόν**, ὅφιν, τετυχηκέναι ταύτης τῆς δωρεᾶς· ἀποδυόμενον γὰρ τὸ γῆρας πάλιν ἐξ ὑπαρχῆς ἀνηβᾶν· ἄτοπον δ' εἶναι ἢ τὰ κρείττω τοῦ χείρονος ἢ ἑνὸς τὰ πάντα λειφθῆναι. δίκην μέντοι τοῦ τολμήματος ἔδωκε τὴν προσήκουσαν· ἑτερόγλωττα γὰρ εὐθὺς ἐγένετο, ὡς ἐξ ἐκείνου μηκέτ' ἀλλήλων ἐπακοῦσαι δυνηθῆναι χάριν τῆς ἐν ταῖς διαλέκτοις εἰς ἃς ἡ μία καὶ κοινὴ πάντων ἐτμήθη, διαφορᾶς.

25. See Jedrkiewicz (1989) 54–55, N. Hopkinson, *Greek Poetry of the Imperial Period: An Anthology* (Cambridge, 1994), 3–4 and his remarks on Babrius passim.

26. L. Früchtel, "Zur Äsopfabel des Kallimachos," *Gymnasium* 57 (1950): 123–24.

> Another story of similar type to this concerning the unison of voice of the animals is ascribed to the makers of myth. For it is told how all the animals, however so many there are on land, in the water, and winged of old were of unison of voice, and in the same fashion that Greeks discourse in a common tongue with Greeks, and foreigners with foreigners, in this way all conversed with all about what they chanced to do or experience, so as even to be grieved together at misfortunes and, if anything advantageous occurred, to share in their rejoicing. For imparting to each other their joys and sorrows by means of their unison of language they rejoiced and mourned together, and as a result of this a similarity of character and experience was realized, until the point when they became sated with the abundance of their present good fortune, as is often wont to happen, and they ran aground against their desire for the unattainable. They sent an embassy concerning immortality, requesting release from old age and requesting the pinnacle of youth forever, saying that among them one of the creatures already had attained this gift, the slithering one, the snake. For by shedding his old age he becomes young again. It was illogical, [they claimed], that the stronger be left behind the weaker or all behind one. However they paid a fitting penalty for this act of daring. For straightway they became of various tongues, so as from that time to no longer be able to comprehend one another because of the difference of the languages into which the one common one of all had been divided.

In commenting on this passage Pfeiffer observes[27] that Philo elsewhere draws on Callimachus,[28] and in particular that the phrase ἔκλυcιν γήρωc may be the end of a choliambic line. There are several more parallels. Philo's grouping of living creatures (ζῷα) as χερσαῖα καὶ ἔνυδρα καὶ πτηνὰ [on land, in the water, and winged] gives considerable support to P. Bing's suggestion[29] that by τοὺν θαλάccῃ [that which dwells in the sea] Callimachus has in mind sea creatures generally, rather than a particular species (an issue that has troubled scholarship on the poem). Philo's phrase ἐπρεσβεύετο γήρως ἔκλυσιν . . . αἰτούμενα confirms the phrase and usage of the diegete's κατὰ λύcιν γήρωc ἐπ[ρέ]ccβευcεν.[30] Philo's τὸ ἑρπετόν designating the snake finds an interesting parallel in Callimachus' poem, where τῶν ἑρπετῶν (at line 7) refers to all of the animal figures. Callimachus uses the term ἑρπετόν elsewhere in his poetry in both senses.[31] Here the poet may be playing with an original version of the fable. Callimachus may not have included the snake and its renewed skin in his version, or at any rate the Diegesis does not refer

27. Add. et Corr. II 117.

28. See Pfeiffer to fr. 114.8–9.

29. Bing (1981) 33–36

30. On the verb πρεσβεύω with the sense "to request" see Früchtel (1950) 124 editor's note.

31. Cf. *Hymn* 1.12–13 οὐδέ τί μιν κεχρημένον Εἰλειθυίηc | ἑρπετὸν οὐδὲ γυνὴ ἐπιμίcγεται.

to this. Nor does the diegete refer to a more extended complaint of the swan on the occasion of the animals' embassy. Callimachus' choice of τῶν ἑρπετῶν is in any event worth noting here as so much of the surrounding lines is a play in effect on the original fable.

The version of the fable preserved in Philo refers to the animals' embassy to gain release from old age, but does not specify a spokesman. The inclusion of the swan in this embassy in *Iambus* 2 may not be original to Callimachus. However, the association of the swan with song, and also the association of this figure with old age and death are *topoi* of Callimachean poetic statement. These associations occur earlier in Greek literature (e.g. Pl. *Phaed.* 85b), and the Alexandrian poet in varied ways appropriates them as his own. The inclusion of the swan's voice in the fable of *Iambus* 2, the final lines of which center on the milieu of the poet's literary contemporaries, becomes the more significant when read against Callimachus' other compositions of the same figure—for the choice here in *Iambus* 2 is hardly a haphazard one.

In the two Apolline hymns (2 and 4) the poet singles out the swan's song for its association with the god Apollo. At the beginning of *Hymn* 2 the swan's song heralds the god's arrival:

καὶ δή που τὰ θύρετρα καλῷ ποδὶ Φοῖβος ἀράσσει·
οὐχ ὁράᾳς; ἐπένευσεν ὁ Δήλιος ἡδύ τι φοίνιξ
ἐξαπίνης, ὁ δὲ κύκνος ἐν ἠέρι καλὸν ἀείδει.
Callim. *Hy.* 2.3–5

And surely Phoebus strikes the doorposts with his fair foot.
Don't you see? The Delian palm all of a sudden nods sweetly,
and the swan sings beautifully in the air.

In *Hymn* 4 the swan's song is associated with the birth of Apollo on Delos:

ἡ μὲν ἔφη· κύκνοι δὲ †θεοῦ μέλποντες ἀοιδοί†
Μηόνιον Πακτωλὸν ἐκυκλώσαντο λιπόντες
ἑβδομάκις περὶ Δῆλον, ἐπήισαν δὲ λοχείῃ
Μουσάων ὄρνιθες, ἀοιδότατοι πετεηνῶν
(ἔνθεν ὁ παῖς τοσσάσδε λύρῃ ἐνεδήσατο χορδάς
ὕστερον, ὁσσάκι κύκνοι ἐπ' ὠδίνεσσιν ἄεισαν).
Callim. *Hy.* 4.249–54

So she spoke. And the swans [the musician singers of the god]
leaving Maeonian Pactolus flew in circles
seven times around Delos, and the birds of the Muses
sang on the occasion of the birth, the most songful of winged creatures
(hence the child later bound as many chords to his lyre,
as swans that sang at the time of his mother's labor pains).

This association of the swan with Apollo may have been reflected at the end of the *Aetia* prologue in the poet's own self-fashioning. N. Hopkinson conjectures the following text for lines 39–40:[32]

> Μουcάων δὲ καὶ ὄρνι]c, ἐ[πεὶ] πτερὸν οὐκέτι κινεῖν
> οἶδε, πέλει φων]ῆι τ[ῆ]μοc ἐνεργότατοc.
>
> And the bird of the Muses, when it knows no longer to move its wing, is then most active in voice.

The swan's association with Apollo and the swan's final song are in these instances motifs that evoke a sacred quality of song, and synecdochically of singer. Especially striking in this regard is Callimachus' deployment of the same motifs in *Iambus* 4.[33] Here, in the setting of a stylistic agon, the olive tree opens its apologia with precisely these motifs (lines 46–48):

> ὦ πάντα καλή, τῶν ἐμῶν τὸ κ[άλλιcτον
> ἐν τῇ τελευτῇ κύκνοc [ὡc ’Απόλλωνοc
> ἤειcαc· οὕτω μὴ κάμοιμ[ι ποιεῦcα.
>
> Fair one in every way, [as] the swan [of Apollo]
> you sang the fairest of my features at the end.
> May I not tire in [acting] thus.

The sole witness for the swan's role in *Iambus* 2 is the diegete's cryptic comment μέχρι | κατὰ λύcιν γήρωc ἐπ[ρέ]cβευcεν ὁ κύ | κνοc πρὸc τοὺc θεοὺc [until the swan went on an embassy to the gods for the release from old age]. We do not know, therefore, how Callimachus may have treated this part of the fable in the poem, nor what nuances he may have given to this emissary. There may have been here a variation, or subtle play, on the association of the swan's song with the poet / singer's own song, an association which arises elsewhere in Callimachus' verse. This need not necessarily mean that the poem's audience is meant to

32. N. Hopkinson, ed., *A Hellenistic Anthology* (Cambridge, 1988), 15–16, 98.

33. Another passage of interest here occurs in the *Hecale* (fr. 260.56–57 Pf., Hollis fr. 74.15–16) where the swan, one of several examples of the color white, also appears in an eristic context:

> εἶτε κόραξ, ὃc νῦν γε καὶ ἂν κύκνοιcιν ἐρίζοι,
> καὶ γάλακι χροιὴν καὶ κύματοc ἄκρῳ ἀώτῳ,
>
> when the raven, which now might compete even with the swans,
> or with milk, in its skin, or with the topmost foam of the wave

The image of the swan, its song, and its association with Apollo, crosses generic boundaries in Callimachus, and is generally a symbol of aesthetic perfection—hence the swan's role in *Iambus* 2 is the more intriguing.

oversimplistically identify the poet's voice with that of the overdemanding swan. Rather in a poem that has as its *tour de force* the association of the poet's contemporaries with animal sounds, the image of the swan fearing old age would already be a clever introduction of the *paraprosdokion* which follows. The figures of speaking animals in the reign of Cronus (line 4 τἀπὶ Κρόνου) appear in a variety of contexts in classical Greek literature;[34] it would not be surprising if Callimachus, who develops this narrative in such a surprising way at the poem's conclusion, had added a contemporary nuance earlier.

MEN OF ANIMAL VOICE

Lines 4–17 of *Iambus* 2 have generally been thought to take up from the second part of the animal narrative as we have it in the Diegesis; lines 4–5 would then be the conclusion of the fox's speech. Hence for example, Kapsomenos (1937) proposed that the opening of line 5 read λέγουσα, and that the subject of the feminine participle is the fox, ἡ ἀλώπηξ.[35] It is certainly the case that line 6 δίκαιος ὁ [Ζε]ύς, οὐ δίκαι[α] δ' αἰcυμνέ̣ω̣ν [just is Zeus, but not justly ruling] is parallel to the diegete's summary of the fox's speech καὶ ἀλώπηξ τὸν | Δία ἐτόλμηcεν μὴ δικαίωc ἄρχειν φά | ναι [and the fox dared to say that Zeus did not rule justly]. However, the poet himself utters these sentiments, *his* voice makes the declaration the diegete assigns to the fox.[36] For this reason simply assigning lines 4–5 to the ἀλώπηξ is problematic. I am inclined to wonder whether the remark of the diegete does not in fact refer to lines in the lost section of the poem (and not, therefore, only to lines 4–5). I would suggest rather that Callimachus may have begun his concluding play on the fable with a partial repetition of, or allusion to, an earlier (and now lost) complaint of the fox.[37] On one level this would acknowledge the fable's traditional narrative. This is a characteristic Callimachean technique (and not only Callimachean) in embarking on a new and unexpected narrative line. So line 6 δίκαιος ὁ [Ζε]ύς, οὐ

34. Cf. Pl. *Plt.* 272b8-d2. Cf. also Xen. *Mem.* 2.7.13. This theme appears particularly in a number of comic poets, the Θηρία of Crates and apparently the Πλοῦτοι of Cratinus; there are many interpretive problems with the latter.

35. Kapsomenos (1937) 29.

36. So Pfeiffer: "poeta ipse narrare videtur: res ipsa e Dieg. satis certa, at sententiarum structura et nexus adhuc obscura."

37. Such an interpretation would stipulate in particular that the kind of reconstruction of the lost part of this poem which e.g. Hausrath (1949) 51–53 has attempted may be misleading in giving the whole or major part of the lost section to the swan's embassy to the gods.

δίκαι[α] δ̣ʼ αἰcυμνέ̣ω̣ν in essence presents the audience with a paradox not unlike that of the opening lines of *Iambus* 1. The fable of voiced animals, seemingly a tale meant to draw the audience's attention to the period and place of its ancient derivation, is revealed to be not only applicable to but in fact to continue in the setting of contemporary Alexandria. At the same time such a repetition of the complaint of one of the fable's animal characters has a subtle foreshadowing effect; the poet repeats the words of a speaking animal just before cataloguing men's animal speechlessness.

There may well be some support for such an interpretation in the occurrence of line 4 of our text τὰπὶ Κρόνου τε καὶ ἔτι τὰ πρὸ τη[[in the time of Cronus' rule, and still before], after an unknown number of missing lines. This expression of time in effect repeats the temporal setting of the first three lines. The repetition of the temporal setting concludes the traditional animal fable with a permeable border, through which the poet draws the essence of the fable to his own time. The final three lines of the poem, I would add, effect something of the same transference in the opposite direction. Callimachus juxtaposes at line 15 a contemporary reference in the apostrophe to Andronicus with the introduction of Aesop and his reception at the hands of the Delphians, thus bringing us back at the very end of the poem to the world of the fable's origin. In other words, lines 4–5, with the repetition of the opening temporal setting and a (possible) reference to the fox's complaint, have the appearance of the kind of summary that leads to a change in narrative structure. Further, line 5 λ[έγ]ουcα (Kapsomenos and others) or λ[αλ]οῦcα (M. Griffith[38]) would refer also to the period when the animals could speak, and so would be a further element of repetition.

For the poem's audience, especially one familiar with the original fable, the narrative continues to evolve in an unexpected direction in lines 7–10. In Philo's version of the fable the animals' complaint was that Zeus was unjust in giving eternal life to one of their number and not to all. In lines 6–7 of *Iambus* 2 the poet's charge is rather that Zeus committed an injustice in on the one hand (line 7 [μ]έν) cutting off the voice of the animals and on the other hand (line 8 δέ) giving this voice to the human race. The audience recognizes here with a certain surprise that the speaker can hardly be one of the animal characters of the fable. Lines 8–10 reveal the speaker to rather be human, and the Aesopic fable to have taken on a quite different dimension. In spite of the two lacunae in these lines it is still possible to observe the dramatic

38. In personal communication.

delay of this change—Callimachus reserves ἀνδρῶν (line 10) until the very end. The poem's narrator has somehow transformed a fable of anthropomorphized animals into a paradigm which includes men, yet at this point even with the specific ἡμέων of the parenthesis (line 9) it remains unclear to what group of men the poet means to refer.

There then follows at lines 10–13 a further revelation—the men of this new version of the fable are the poet's Alexandrian contemporaries. In a startling thematic reversal it is not the figures of the animal kingdom that are characterized by human voice, but rather humans characterized with animal sound. The fable remains etiological, but it is not the origin of human language that is the poet's concern, but the origin of his contemporaries' babbling noises. Aesop as narrator of fable transferred human language to animals; Callimachus transfers animal sound to humans.

The poet names two figures in lines 10–11 as we have them κιυ̣νὸc [μ]ὲ[ν] ιΕὔ̣δ̣ημοc, | ὄινο̣υ δὲ Φίλτων, [And Eudemus has the voice of a dog, and Philton that of an ass]. The structure of the short catalogue that these two lines comprise (single animal in the genitive, particle, proper name) suggests that a further proper name occurred in the lacuna at the end of line 11. The identity of Eudemus and Philton is unknown. There is an Eudemus who is the subject of *Ep.* 47 (28 G.-P.), but nothing indicates that this is the same Eudemus.[39] The name Philton does not occur elsewhere in Callimachus' extant verse. Two factors suggest, I believe, that these are either the poet's actual contemporaries, or are meant to be understood as familiars of the poetic narrator of these lines in the context of *Iambus* 2. (1) The apostrophe of Andronicus at line 15 also sets the poem in an "occasional" context, imitating the occasional nature of archaic iambic poetry with its known figures.[40] (2) The poet does not characterize either figure in any way that demarcates them as belonging to another time or place, no epithet serves as a mnemonic for the poem's audience; compare his presentation of Aesop Aι῎cωπoc | ὁ Cαρδιηνόc, or that of Euhemerus in *Iambus* 1.10–11 οὗ τὸν πάλαι Πάγχαιoιν ὁ πλάcαc Zᾶνα | γέρων λαλάζων ἄδικα βιβλία ψήχει. My point here is not so much to emphasize these figures as historical entities but as literary ones. In the context of *Iambus* 2 Callimachus means them to be understood as figures readily identifiable for the poetic voice and for his audience. Some of the figures of bucolic poetry, such as Daphnis, may serve as a perhaps surprising yet valid analogy.

39. D'Alessio (1996) 594, n. 46. The epigram coincidentally has an element of *paraprosdokion* not dissimilar to that of *Iambus* 2; see Gutzwiller (1998) 193.

40. See Depew (1992) 321–23.

Clayman has a very intriguing suggestion on these figures (the italics are mine): "There was a well-known Eudemos, a fifth century Athenian druggist, who frequently appeared in Attic comedy as a dispenser of amulets and poisons (Ar. *Pl.* 883). *It may be that Callimachus is here using a traditional comic figure to present the character of the man he is insulting,* as Horace (*Sat.* 2.8) describes a dinner at which there are characters with stock comic names such as Porcius who eats like a pig, and Balatro, a buffoon."[41] Recent work on earlier iambic poetry, particularly on Archilochus, posits that the figures of archaic iambic may not be biographical entities but rather roles belonging to the genre,[42] which makes Clayman's suggestion more intriguing.

The most sensible interpretive approach, given the ambiguous status of these figures, is, I believe, to understand Eudemus, Philton, and whoever appeared by name in the lacuna of line 11, as contemporaries of the poetic voice of this poem. The crucial point is that Callimachus has not taken these figures from Aesopic fable. Rather he means them to be readily perceived by his intended audience as figures familiar both to the poetic voice and to his audience. Clearly this interpretation takes the concept of "contemporary" in a broad sense, one that may well be figurative rather than local or historical. The most important point, however, remains the same. In *Iambus* 2 Callimachus introduces figures either individually, as Philton and Eudemus, or collectively, as the tragedians of line 12,[43] who are not part of the of animal fable in which they so surprisingly appear.

At line 11 ψιττακοῦ δ̣ε̣[[and of the parrot] a proper name or noun consisting of three long syllables, or of two long syllables and a *brevis in longo,* has fallen out of the text. Von Arnim[44] conjectured [ῥητῆρεc [rhetoricians] which has been generally, and perhaps overhastily, accepted by the majority of the poem's interpreters.[45] Two factors have hitherto been felt to support this conjecture: (1) the absence of a third proper name in the diegete's summary; (2) a perceived need for an antithesis to balance the tragedians in line 12. The first underestimates the summary nature of the Diegesis. While it is true that the diegete

41. Clayman (1980) 18, n. 21.

42. See Nagy (1979) 242–52, West (1974) 26–28.

43. I agree with D'Alessio (1996) 594, n. 46 that Callimachus must mean by τραγῳδοί tragic poets and not tragic actors; cf. *Iambus* 13.32 cὺ δὲ τραγῳδε[ῖν] Cf., however, E. Courtney, "Callimachus *Iambus* II, Fr. 192," *ZPE* 74 (1988): 276 and H. Richards, *CR* 14 (1900): 201–14.

44. *Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akad.* 164 (1910) Abh. 4.14.

45. See Dawson (1950) 30, Trypanis (1958) 115 n. d, Clayman (1980) 18–19; D'Alessio (1996) 594, n. 46 is more cautious.

frequently demonstrates a particular interest in proper names, especially of identifiable figures, there are many named figures in the *Iambi* who do not appear. It has not been observed, rather surprisingly, that Andronicus, the addressee of the poem apostrophized at line 15, also does not appear in the Diegesis to this poem. The diegete is as a rule apt to name the addressee, even if this appellation is uncertain, as in the case of *Iambus* 5. The suggestion that an antithesis is needed to balance the tragedians overlooks both the extended and clearly climactic, even unexpected, nature of this line. Further, assuming the reading δ̣ε̣[to be correct, the δέ before this name, like that before Philton, is connective, whereas that of line 12 δὲ τραγῳδοί is rather adversative. There is thus a priamel-like structure to this categorization of figures that Callimachus employs elsewhere in his poetry.[46]

Hausrath followed by Corbato has outlined the problems with von Arnim's conjecture of [ῥητῆρεc.[47] [48] All of the animals listed in lines 10–11 are in the singular, as are the named figures (Eudemus and Philton) to whom the voices of the dog and that of the ass are attributed. On the other hand the phrases οἱ δὲ τραγῳδοί and τῶν θάλαccαν ο̣ἰ̣[κεύντων are obviously plural. There is a correspondence of number in the source of the animal sound and the individual(s) to whom this sound is attributed; the conjectured reading ψιττακοῦ δ̣ὲ̣ [ῥητῆρεc would violate it. Corbato further noted that only the plural ψιττακῶν would maintain such a correspondence; the reading ψιττακοῦ is, however, certain. I would add that throughout the poem plural collective groups always occur with the article, for example, line 12 οἱ δὲ τραγῳδοί, line 13 οἱ δὲ πάντεc [ἄνθρωποι, line 16 οἱ Δελφοί; its omission in this instance is suspect. Finally, aside from the priamel structure, which is the

46. Cf. as one of many parallel examples e.g. *Aetia* fr. 75.22–27 Pf.

''Αρτέμιδοc τῇ παιδὶ γάμον βαρὺc ὅρκοc ἐνικλῷ·
Λύγδαμιν οὐ γὰρ ἐμὴ τῆμοc ἔκηδε κάcιc
οὐδ' ἐν 'Αμυκλαίῳ θρύο̣ν ἔπλεκεν οὐδ' ἀπὸ θήρηc
ἔκλυζεν ποταμῷ λ̣ύ̣ματα Παρθενίῳ,
Δήλῳ δ' ἦν ἐπίδημοc, 'Ακόντιον ὀππότε cὴ παῖc
ὤμοcεν, οὐκ ἄλλον, νυμφίον ἐξέμεναι.

"A strict oath to Artemis binds your daughter in marriage.
For my sister was not then troubling Lygdamis,
nor weaving rushes in Amyclae, nor washing off
the gore from the hunt in the Parthenian river,
but was resident in Delos, when your daughter swore
to have Acontius, and no other, as her bridegroom.

47. Hausrath (1949) 55.
48. Corbato (1979) 55.

more important point, there remain the significant triads observable throughout the extant lines of the poem; in the classification of the animals in the opening lines (τό τε πτηνόν, τοὺν θαλάccῃ, τὸ τετράπουν), in the adjectives of lines 13–14 (πάντεc, πουλύμυθοι, λάλοι), and even perhaps in the syntactical structure of the final lines of the poem (εἶπεν, ᾄδοντα, ἐδέξαντο). We should not too quickly overlook the prominence of these triads.

The poet assigns to tragedians (line 12) the voice of "those which dwell in the sea" (line 12 τῶν θάλαccαν οἰ[κεύντων). These last are probably sea creatures in general. The "problem" of these figures' exact identity is in large part a creation of the poem's modern interpreters. Pfeiffer notes in his commentary on these lines that sea creatures were not necessarily thought in antiquity to be voiceless,[49] and this is clearly not the case earlier in *Iambus* 2 itself (lines 2–3 τοὺν θαλάccῃ . . . ἐφθέγγεθ'). P. Bing[50] has argued that Callimachus is referring not to silence, but to the "muselessness" of sea creatures, a characteristic spelt out specifically by Empedocles (DK fr. 74 φῦλον ἄμουσον ἄγουσα πολυσπερέων καμασήνων). The line Pfeiffer cites from Babrius Prol. 1.10, ἐλάλει δὲ κἰχθύc [even the fish babbled] is particularly suggestive here, as Callimachus uses λαλέω and related words to denigrate those he satirizes; for example, *Iambus* 1.11 λαλάζων of Euhemerus, 13.17 λαλευcι[. .]. .[in the speech of the delineated critic, and here at 2.14 λάλοι of men. The voicelessness specifically of fishes was debated in antiquity (cf. fr. 533 Pf.), but this is not apparently at issue in *Iambus* 2. The phrase τὸ ἔνυδρον in Philo's version of the fable and the parallel narrative line of Philo's account lend considerable support to this line of reasoning.[51] However, interpretations of these lines of *Iambus* 2 that derive a comment by Callimachus on the silence, that is, the decline, of tragedy in the Hellenistic period are overimaginative.

If, indeed, those that dwell in the sea are "museless,"[52] the choice of other specific animal voices in these lines is surely also significant, as a survey of relevant passages in Callimachus' poetry demonstrates. The interweaving of fable and contemporary milieu turns out to be

49. Pfeiffer ad loc. "pisces non muti fuerant cf. v. 2 et Babr. prooem. I. 10 ἐλάλει δὲ κἰχθύc; de βόμβῳ κόγχων cogitavit O. Immisch *Rh.M.* 79 (1930) 161, 1."

50. Bing (1981) 35.

51. Cf., however, D'Alessio (1996) 594, n. 46 on ψοφεῖν.

52. ἄμουcον is one of many conjectures proposed for *Aetia* fr. 1.7 . . . . .].[.]καὶ Τε[λ]χῖcιν ἐγὼ τόδε· 'φῦλον α[[and I this to the Telchines, "Race]; see C. Meillier, "Callimaque, Aitia, fr. 1, v. 7, et l'unité probable des fragments 1 (invective) et 2 (songe)," *ZPE* 33 (1979): 39 f., and Bing (1981) 35–36. This would supply a parallel of Callimachus' use of this concept in denigrating his opponents.

two-directional. The poet's contemporaries appear, surprisingly, in the context of animal fable, while at the same time the animal figures themselves turn out to be emblematic of poetic aesthetic statements Callimachus voices elsewhere. The ass (ὄνος) we have already discussed in the context of Callimachus' use of Aesopic fable in the *Aetia* prologue; his is the bray the poet seeks at all costs to avoid. The dog (κύων) is also symbolic of a particular poetic stance at several points in Callimachus' verse, most strikingly in the context of iambic poetry.[53] The word κύων in Callimachus' poetry appears also as a term of abuse or reproach.[54] Like the ass, the image of the dog is generally a pejorative one,[55] outside of certain narrative contexts in the hymns (e.g. the hunting dogs of Artemis).

More problematic, because far less attested in extant classical and Hellenistic literature, is the parrot, ὁ ψιττακός, as a figurative image. However, given the generic characteristics of this bird it is not hard to conjecture the point of its appearance here. Parrots, in addition to producing harsh sounds, mindlessly imitate, which is exactly the flaw Cal-

53. At *Iambus* 1.82–83 the speaker characterizes one of the maddened crowd as a dog: ὁ δ' ἐξόπισθε Κω[ρ]υκαῖος ἐγχάσκει | τὴν γλῶσσαν †ελων ὡς κύων ὅταν πίνῃ [The Corycean gapes from behind (curling?) his tongue like a dog when it drinks.] In the one extant fragment of Callimachus' epic poem the *Grapheion* (fr. 380 Pf.) the poet Archilochus is portrayed as having the temper of a dog: εἵλκυσε δὲ δριμύν τε χόλον κυνὸς ὀξύ τε κέντρον | σφηκός, ἀπ' ἀμφοτέρων δ' ἰὸν ἔχει στόματος [he drew a dog's bitter bile and a wasp's sharp sting, and has the mouth's poison of both.]

54. As in *Aetia* fr. 75.4–5, where the poet chides himself on his own lack of restraint in speech: Ἥρην γάρ κοτέ φασι—κύον, κύον, ἴσχεο, λαιδρέ | θυμέ, σύ γ' ἀείσῃ καὶ τά περ οὐχ ὁσίη [For they say Hera once—dog, dog, hold back, rash heart, you would sing even those things which may not be spoken.] And Demeter to Erysichthon at *Hymn* 6.63–64: ναὶ ναί, τεύχεο δῶμα, κύον κύον, ᾧ ἔνι δαῖτας | ποιησεῖς· θαμιναὶ γὰρ ἐς ὕστερον εἰλαπίναι τοι. [Yes, yes, build your house, you dog, you dog, in which you will have your feasts. For later your banquets will be many.]

55. A very interesting, if also very enigmatic fragment pertinent to this discussion is fr. 664 Pf. The place of this fragment in the Callimachean corpus is uncertain. The fragment itself is supplied by the scholia to line 475–76 of Ovid's *Ibis:*

> *praedaque sis illis, quibus est Latonia Delos*
> *ante diem rapto non adeunda Thaso*
>
> And may you be prey for those, for whom since Thasus' destruction
> approach to Latona's Delos before day is denied

Sacerdos Apollinis Delii Anius fuit, ad quem cum venisset per noctem filius eius Thasus, a canibus laniatus est, unde Delon nullus canis accedit auctore Callimacho, [Anius was priest of Apollo at Delos; when his son Thasus came to him by night, he was lacerated by dogs. From this time no dog came to Delos, according to Callimachus]. Delos is, of course, the birthplace of Apollo, the god with whom Callimachus associates himself as a poet.

limachus associates with other contemporary poets in the *Aetia* prologue and particularly with those of choliambic verse in *Iambus* 13.[56]

A prevalent characteristic of Callimachus' poetry is the importance of sound. Throughout the hymns Callimachus evokes sound for vividness of portrayal, for example, *Hymn* 5.14 cυρίγγων ἀίω φθόγγον ὑπαξόνιον.[57] In *Ep.* 28.5-6 Pf. (2 G.-P.) the echo at the end of the poem is at one and the same time a verbal play and a poetic statement.[58] In the *Aetia* prologue the Telchines grumble (line 1 ἐπιτρύζουcιν), and the poet chooses to leave the sound of bombastic thunder to Zeus (lines 19–20): μηδ' ἀπ' ἐμεῦ διφᾶιτε μέγα ψοφέουcαν ἀοιδήν | τίκτεcθαι· βροντᾶιν οὐκ ἐμόν, ⌊ἀλλὰ⌋ Διόc [Do not seek from me that I produce a song which gives forth great amounts of noise. To thunder is not my task, but Zeus']. In *Iambus* 2 Callimachus is able, through the medium of a traditional fable that tells of the silencing of animal speech, to elaborate and explore the significances of sound. By including his contemporaries in this fable, he represents them as, in effect, unpleasant, unpoetic noises.

Iambus 1 opens with the figure of a Callimachean Hipponax, who is shown in the subsequent lines to be transferred to an Alexandrian setting. In *Iambus* 2 there is another transferred figure, Aesop, who appears only in the final lines. A comparison of the introductions of these two figures illustrates their complementary nature. These introductions, and the manner in which the poet deploys these archaic figures, are variations on the same theme—a figure who comes from elsewhere to dispense wisdom among the disharmonious, who is at the same time an anachronism in 3rd-century Alexandria. The presentation of these two figures is in certain aspects similar and in others different. Both are presented as ill-received figures of wisdom, transferred to religious sites in a foreign location, the Hipponactean voice to the temple of Sara-

56. Ovid in the opening of *Am.* 2.6 *Psittacus, Eois imitatrix ales ab Indis,* [parrot, winged mimic from the eastern Indies,] evokes this aspect of the parrot to a different end, in a poem that is itself self-consciously imitative. See S. Hinds, *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry* (Cambridge, 1998), 4–5.

57. See Bulloch (1985) 123.

58.

> Λυcανίη, cὺ δὲ ναίχι καλὸc καλόc—ἀλλὰ πρὶν εἰπεῖν
> τοῦτο cαφῶc, ἠχώ φηcί τιc· 'ἄλλοc ἔχει.'
>
> Lysanias, you are fair, yes fair. Yet before uttering
> this clearly, some echo says "He is another's."

For recent discussion of the sound effects at the end of this epigram and their significance see Koenen (1993) 84–89, Cameron (1995) 391–93, D'Alessio (1996) 243, n. 39, Gutzwiller (1998) 221–22.

pis in Alexandria, Aesop to Delphi. Both are characterized, surprisingly, even anachronistically, with the verb ἀείδω; iambic poetry is recited, and fable is narrative prose. The poetic voice of *Iambus* 1 comes from Hades bearing a *iambos* that does not sing (line 3 ⟦ἀείδ⟧οντα) of the Bupalean battle, while Aesop is ill received by the Delphians as he sings (line 17 ᾄδοντα) his tale (μῦθον[59]). Yet whereas the Hipponactean figure of *Iambus* 1 is incorporated into the Alexandrian setting, Aesop in *Iambus* 2 is placed outside of the contemporary realm—the narrator does not assume the persona of Aesop, to whom he refers in the third person (lines 15–16 ταῦτα δ' Αι⟦ϊ⟧cωπoc | ὁ Cαρδιηνὸc εἶπεν) and whom he places in his own historical setting. Callimachus deploys both Hipponax and Aesop to valorize his own poetic voice; in the first case, as a choliambic poet, and, in the second, as a narrator of fable. But he does this in different and contrasting ways in the two poems. In *Iambus* 1 Callimachus transfers the figure of the original to contemporary Alexandria; in *Iambus* 2 Callimachus transfers not the figure, but his composition, animal fable. In *Iambus* 1 the novelty of Callimachus' achievement lies in large part in the use of choliambic poetry as a medium for aesthetic criticism of literature and its composers; in *Iambi* 2 and 4 in the use of fable to the same end.

Iambus 4

INTRODUCTION

The centerpiece of Callimachus' *Iambus* 4 is a rhetorical agon of two trees, the laurel and the olive. This poem is one of the most alluring and enigmatic of the collection. Its allure derives from its elaborate presentation of a type of agonistic fable, well known from a number of pre-Greek cultures, in a new context of elevated literary discourse. The exact character of the allegorical nature of this presentation and some of the interpretive questions such an allegory raises make it enigmatic. The former aspect has been studied early in this century by H. Diels,[60] and more recently as part of a larger study by M. L. West of Near Eastern influence on Hellenistic and Roman literature.[61] The latter aspect has drawn, and continues to draw, considerable attention in the schol-

59. μῦθος here may also allude to the "place" of Aesop in rhetorical theory. See Jedrkiewicz (1989) 290–91.

60. H. Diels, "Orientalische Fabeln in griechischem Gewande" *Internationale Wochenschrift für Wissenschaft, Kunst, und Technik* 4 (1910): 993–1002.

61. West (1969) 113–34.

arship on Callimachus and on the influence of Callimachus' *Iambi* on the development of Roman satire.

In the following pages I center my interpretation on two areas in discussing this, the longest of the surviving *Iambi*. The first is Callimachus' use of this fable as a paradigm. Callimachus has taken a simple popular narrative structure and refashioned it as a mirror of Alexandria: scholarly, detailed, and poetically self-referential. The second focal point of my study is a marshaling of specific elements in the agon's two speeches, which clearly suggests an interpretation of the fable as a debate of aesthetic stylistics. While it has long been recognized that the fable of the laurel and the olive is in some sense allegorical, discussion of this aspect of the poem has been often deflected onto attempts to identify the various speakers as biographical figures.[62] I would argue rather that the allegorical nature of the dispute lies in its representation of a debate between different aesthetics, quite probably literary stylistics. The victor is clearly the simple, the olive, when attacked by the more elevated, the laurel.

In the agon of the laurel and the olive the poet has set forth two contrasting aesthetics, one grand, one subtle. Yet this opposition is cleverer and subtler than simple antithesis. Callimachus has made the two speakers of his fable, of his rendition of a seemingly simple form of popularly transmitted narrative, not only "literate" in their mythology, but literate in their knowledge of Callimachus' own poetry. It has long been noted that the chattering of the two crows and the reference to Theseus' stay at Hecale's hut is a marked reference to Callimachus' *Hecale*.[63] However the poem's modern interpreters have, surprisingly, overlooked the fact that all of the specific references to mythological material in the agon's two speeches can be understood, and I would argue are meant to be understood, as references to other works of Callimachus. Branchus (line 28), the favorite of Apollo and the founder of the god's cult at Didyma, is the central figure of Callimachus' "lyric"

62. On the allegorical nature of the poem see M. C. Waites, "Some Features of the Allegorical Debate in Greek Literature," *HSCP* 23 (1912): 37–39. D. Clayman has examined the agon as a rhetorical set piece, "Callimachus' Fourth Iamb," *CJ* 74 (1978/79): 142–48. Both Knox, "Herodas and Callimachus," *Philologus* 81 (1925/26): 253–54 and Puelma Piwonka (1949) 237–47 have tried to identify Callimachus with one of the principle voices of the fable, and to draw the other voices from his circle in Alexandria. This "biographical" approach to the clearly allegorical nature of the poem would find less favor now, and the example cited of Theocr. *Idyll* 7 is no longer especially convincing, as the *masquerade bucolique* has been largely rejected, at least on a literal level, as an interpretation of the later poem.

63. Dawson (1950) 54. The *Hecale* has been greatly augmented by new papyrus discoveries; see *SH* frr. 280–91 (pp. 122–35), and Hollis' commentary to the new fragments.

poem *Branchus* (fr. 229 Pf.). The *Daphnephoria* (lines 34–36) is one of the opening *aitia* of *Aetia* 4 (frr. 86–89 Pf.). The discovery of the olive is one of Athena's attributes in *Hymn* 5 (lines 25–26 ἐμπεράμως ἐτρίψατο λιτὰ βαλοῖσα | χρίματα, τᾶς ἰδίας ἔκγονα φυταλιᾶς, [and with skill she took up and rubbed in simple oils, the product of her own growing]). The resting-place of Leto (line 84) appears again in *Iambus* 13 (line 62) and at the conclusion of *Hymn* 4 (line 326). The two trees debate not only in terms of Callimachean poetics, but in part in terms of his poetry. The poet has raised fable to the level of literary discourse, and made the figures of simple folk narrative the representatives of poetic aesthetics. The trees from Lydian Tmolus of old, the world of Aesop, speak in the idiom of Callimachus' contemporary Alexandria.

The laurel and the olive are emblematic of the larger program of *Iambi* as a collection. Just as the poet has taken the figures of a popular narrative form, the fable, and given them the faculty of aesthetic critique, so he has taken iambic poetry, in the archaic period the medium of personal invective, and given it the faculty of engaging in other types of discourse. Both are instances of the reinvention of a genre, a reinvention that, while conscious of the earlier form and deliberately alluding to an ancient tale, or Hipponax of old, then transcends any boundary that the evocation of the earlier form might invite in the minds of the poem's audience. In this way choliambic poetry becomes now a medium for literary criticism, and the figures of Aesopic fable become the voices of Callimachus' Alexandria.

Modern interpretations of *Iambus* 4 have turned, rightly, to the agon of Aristophanes' *Frogs,* the stylistic debate of Aeschylus and Euripides, as an example of a similar dispute in earlier Greek literature. An agon more pertinent in some respects to that of *Iambus* 4 is that of Tragedy and Elegy in Ovid's *Amores* 3.1. Indeed, there are several features of this later poem that strongly suggest that Ovid had the debate of *Iambus* 4 in mind when he composed his work. This Roman elegiac parallel lends considerable support to interpreting the agon of *Iambus* 4 as one of aesthetic styles.[64]

64. In part *Am.* 3.1 is a rendition of another Augustan theme borrowed from Callimachean poetics, the *recusatio.* Aside from the parallel structure, the order of the speeches, and the manner of speaking, Tragedy wroth, Elegy *subridens,* there are some rather more specific possible allusions to *Iambus* 4. Whereas Tragedy points out that the poet's elegiac composition is making him a subject of popular joke, Elegy takes some pride in her more popular role. The initial response of Elegy to Tragedy (lines 37–38) is very like that of the olive to the laurel: the adversary has provided the best argument for her own defeat. Elegy's denomination of Tragedy as *gravis* and *sublimis* reflects that of the olive's denomination of the laurel as e.g. καλή—all are adjectives which can be understood, in terms of literary criticism, to refer to certain kinds and perceptions of

The narrative of the fable begins early in the poem, at line 6 ἄκουιε]δὴ τὸν αἶνον, and may well continue somewhat beyond the final line (106) of the long section preserved in *P. Oxy.* 1011.[65] The masculine forms of lines 107–12 strongly suggest that the poet has returned here to the frame in which he sets this fable as a paradigm (the trees of the *ainos* being feminine). It is not clear how many lines are missing between lines 106 and 107. This is already a long poem for this collection, which makes me rather disinclined to believe that the number of missing lines would be great. Both of the papyri that include the poem's final extant lines indicate that line 117 of our text is the last line of the poem. The agon of the laurel and the olive is thus not only the centerpiece of the poem, but comprises almost the whole composition. It is important to take this into account in considering to what extent this Aesopic fable is meant to be illustrative qua paradigm and to what extent it is rather a programmatic piece for which the narrative setting serves as the *prophasis* for its telling.

The Diegesis to *Iambus* 4 confirms the poem's eristic character, and adds several details drawn from lost lines of the narrative frame. The Diegesis is not without its own interpretive difficulties; it does, however, demonstrate an early interest in Callimachus' application of fable to a novel milieu. Especially noteworthy in this Diegesis are the number of direct quotations from the poem.

The identity of the figures of the poem's narrative frame, and the diegete's identification of them, is one of several interpretive problems. The patronymic Charitades is that of the third character of the narrative frame, equivalent to the bramble of the fable. The diegete identifies the adversary of the poetic voice only as τινα τῶν ἐφα|μίλλων [one of his rivals]. Given the diegete's penchant for proper names it is safe to assume that this character was not identified further in the original work, and indeed the prosaic ἐφάμιλλοι is in all likelihood an expression only of the diegete's (this term does not occur in extant Greek poetry). The phrase Cῖμοc δέ τιc has given rise to differing interpreta-

---

elevated literature. Many other parallels, among them the physical descriptions of the speakers, particularly the haughty manner of Tragedy and the mock self-deprecation of Elegy, encourage a closer comparison of the two poems. Finally, *Lydius* at line 14, while appropriate, seems at first somewhat unnecessary and stands out as the only such adjective of place aside from the name *Romana tragoedia.* Might not the point be a subtle allusion to *Iambus* 4, where οἱ πάλαι Λυδοί (line 7) are designated the origin of the fable?

65. The final letters of the Diegesis, ειcειc line 18, may well be the end of a 2d pers. sing. fut. fin. verb and part of a quotation from the poem (there are many in this Diegesis). However, it is not clear whether the addressee is that of the fable (perhaps more likely, as this is clearly the cὶ ύ of the previous line), or of the frame (the addressee of line 1, etc.).

tions. A proper name may be meant by this expression, but not necessarily. This could be the name of a stock figure of iambic poetry of this era.[66] The adjective σιμός [snub-nosed] is something of a *topos* in Hellenistic poetry and in later satiric literature for characterizing people in an ironical or comic light; it is particularly frequent in bucolic poetry, for example, in Theocr. *Id.* 3.8–9:

ἦ ῥά γέ τοι σιμὸc καταφαίνομαι ἐγγύθεν ἦμεν,
νύμφα, καὶ προγένειος;

Then do I appear to be snub-nosed to you from up close,
nymph, and does my beard stick out?

Dover's comment on these lines is instructive: "σιμός: 'Snub-nosed' and therefore ugly by Greek standards; the vase-painters give snub noses to satyrs and Egyptians."[67] The original σιμός is Socrates, likened to satyrs or Silenus. In the Greek physiognomers to be σιμός is characteristic of a lecherous temperament, *script. physiognom. Graec.* I p. 429, 6 οἱ τὴν ῥῖνα . . . cιμὴν ἔχοντεc κλέπται καὶ λάγνοι [those who have a snub nose are thieves and lechers]. This characterization is entirely at home in iambic poetry.

Additionally the association of this characteristic with the physically unprepossessing would be especially appropriate as a parallel to the bramble. An important parallel here is the imperative of the poetic voice of *Iambus* 1 to one of the crowd of literati (lines 33–34) ὦ λῷcτε μὴ clίμαιlνε, καὶ γὰρ οὐδ' αὐτόc | μέγα cχολάζ[ω] [Good man, do not turn up your nose, for truly even I have not much time]. There are several intertextual ties between these two poems, and this use of σιμός / σιμαίνω may, I would suggest, have been another.[68]

There are two other areas of difficulty this passage affords aside from the problem of the principals' identity. These are (1) the somewhat confused nature of the exegesis of lines 2–10, and (2) the num-

66. Cf. West (1974) 26–28 on the names in the iambic poetry of Archilochus.

67. Dover (1971) 113.

68. Simos does occur in one of the humorous epigrams of Callimachus as a proper name (*Ep.* 48 Pf. [26 G.-P], line 1).

Although this is hardly an entirely serious poem, it has not, to the best of my knowledge, been suggested that the name and the patronymic of the giver (line 1 Cîμoc ὁ Μίκκου [snub-nosed son of shorty]) are fanciful. Both adjectives are used by the Greek physiognomers to delineate undesirable types (the μικκός is a miser, see Headlam-Knox to Herodas 6.59). In Lucian 22 (Ὄνειρος ἢ Ἀλεκτρυών) the characters Μίκυλλος and Σίμων both appear as illustrations of the characterizations found in e.g. the physiognomers; μικκός in Callimachus' poetry can be understood as well as a metaphor for poetic subject matter. See Gutzwiller (1998) 194.

ber of slips in the citations from the poem itself in roughly the last 7 lines of the Diegesis.

The diegete goes to some lengths to draw the parallel of the narrative frame and the fable. Lines 3–4 Cῖμοc δέ τιc παρατυχὼν παρυπέ|κρουεν ἄμφω παρενδεικνύμενοc [And some snub-nosed type happening by interrupted both to demonstrate], line 14 (π[αρ]επεφύκ̣[ει δ' αὐ]τ̣αῖc) [(it grew next to them)], and lines 6–7 καὶ γὰρ τὸν |αἶνον παρατίθεται ἀκόλουθον [and he adds the following fable], preserve the distinction of the narrative frame from the fable. We observe this distinction also in the extant text of the poem's opening (line 6 ἄκου[ε] δὴ τὸν αἶνον [indeed hear the fable]). The repetition of the verb διαφέρομαι [to differ] of figures of both narrative frame and fable in the text of the Diegesis at lines 2, 8, and 11 underscores the same parallel of fable to narrative setting.

The diegete probably draws the observation that the poet calls his addressee ὁ Θρᾷξ (Dieg. line 5) from the poem itself (cf. ὁ Cαρδιηνόc of Aesop at *Iambus* 2.16). The apparent explanation that the character is so called because he is a boy-thief (line 6 παιδοκλέπτηc—the word occurs only here) is more likely the diegete's own deduction.[69] Both *Iambi* 3 and 5 are concerned with figures for whom the appellation παιδοκλέπτηc would be particularly fitting, and we may well wonder whether the diegete is assuming a common theme of these three poems.[70]

The last six lines of this Diegesis contain an unusual number of citations from the extant lines of *Iambus* 4. In itself this observation is important for assessing other passages of the Diegeseis where such citations can be assumed but not confirmed, (e.g. line 21 of the Diegesis to *Iambus* 1 ἐ]ρίζεcθε, which already Pfeiffer, Norsa, and Vitelli suspected to be a direct quote from the text). The citations are by and large verbally similar, not exact.

Diegesis vii 12–16	*Iambus* 4.98–103
πέπαυθε	παυcόμεcθα
ἐ̣[π]ίχαρτοι	χ̣α̣ρ̣τ̣αί
δυc[μ]ενέcι	ἐχθροῖc
πρ]òc ἣν . . . φη[cίν]	τὴν . . . τάδ' εἶπεν
ἀποβλέψαcα	ὑποδράξ . . . ἔβλεψε

Of the phrases cited in the Diegesis only the exclamatory line ὦ κακὴ λώβη . . . ιὼc δὴ μ̣ί' ἡ |μέ̣μων καὶ cύ (lines 16–17 = *Iambus* 4.102–3) ap-

69. Callimachus does, however, use compounds with παιδο-; cf. fr. 571.2 παιδοφιλεῖν, 26.11 παιδοφόνῳ[.

70. Cf. further D'Alessio (1996) 600, n. 62

pears verbatim. The difference in expression need be no more than one of prose rather than poetic diction. It remains the case, however, that the reader must approach these seemingly direct citations with a certain caution; while they represent the content of the original it is not always an exact representation. The difference may in some instances be more than merely choice of diction; the rendition in the summary may alter the sense of the original. At the end of Callimachus' recounting of the fable in *Iambus* 4 the bramble inserts itself rather subtly into the quarrel by including itself in its admonition to the quarreling trees (line 98) οὐκ . . . παυcόμεcθα, thus giving the understanding that it is on a par with the laurel and the olive. The imperative πέπαυθε (late for πέπαυcθε) in the diegete's summary creates rather a divide between speaker and addressees; the following first person plural γε | νώμεθα at lines 13–14 is not strong enough to counter the change of the first verb, and this spoils the point of the story.

From the Diegesis we may infer the following. (1) There was clearly, as can be seen in the narrative frame, some delineation of the poetic voice and two other characters. The Diegesis at lines 2–3 Διεφέρετο ὁ ποιητὴc πρόc τινα τῶν ἐφα | μίλλων [The poet was arguing with one of his rivals] may mean that the difference between two of the speakers is a literary-aesthetic one (other poets being logically Callimachus' rivals), and there are many elements in the paradigmatic fable to suggest that this may well have been the case. (2) The poet drew the parallel of a fable to that of the situation of the arguing figures of the opening lines of the work. (3) Some quality of the interaction between the laurel and the bramble struck the diegete as particularly remarkable. Even though it appears that the diegete focuses on the opening and closing of poems (as he did for *Iambus* 2), what are in *Iambus* 4 a rather small number of lines occupy a considerable portion of the summary.

THE FABLE

In the text of *Iambus* 4 the circumstance that serves as the "occasion" for the fable's narration is obscure. In the manner of archaic iambic poetry the poet addresses one individual in the opening line Εἷc—οὐ γάρ;—ἡμέων, παῖ Χαριτάδεω, καὶ cύ [One—surely not?—of us, son of Charitades, even you]. The tone is sarcastic, the particle combination οὐ γάρ contributing to the ironic rhetorical effect, the pronoun dragged for emphasis all the way to the end of the verse.

The speaker of the poem's opening introduces his fable early (lines

6–8), in a manner that is clearly didactic and reminiscent of the opening of *Iambus* 1.

ἄκουιεȷ δὴ τὸν αἶνον· ἔἶν κοτε Τμώλῳ
δάφνην ἐλαίῃ νεῖικοc οἱ πάλαι Λυδοί
λέγουcι θέcθαι καὶ γα[

Indeed hear the fable. The Lydians of old
say that once on Tmolus
the laurel took up a quarrel with the olive and γα[

The imperative verb of hearing both evokes the orality of fable and the occasional nature of archaic iambic. As elsewhere in his poetry where Callimachus evolves a literary fable, there is an Aesopic fable (233 Haus. = 213 Perry) that stands as a distant model. The fable of the mulberry, the apple tree, and the bramble is a clear, if by comparison simple, model for the long and complex fable narrative of *Iambus* 4.

ῥοιὰ καὶ μηλέα περὶ εὐκαρπίας ἤριζον. πολλοῦ δὲ τοῦ νείκους ἀναφθέντος βάτος ἐκ τοῦ πλησίον φραγμοῦ ἀκούσασα εἶπεν· "ἀλλ', ὦ φίλαι, παυσώμεθά ποτε μαχόμεναι."

οὕτω παρὰ τὰς τῶν ἀμεινόνων στάσεις καὶ οἱ μηδενὸς ἄξιοι πειρῶνται δοκεῖν τινες εἶναι.

A mulberry tree and an apple tree were quarreling over their fruitfulness. When the argument had flared up and become great, a bramble from the near enclosure having heard them spoke: "But, friends, let us at some point cease fighting."

So on the occasion of strife among their betters even those worth nothing attempt to seem to be somebodies.

There are several similarities in this simpler fable to Callimachus' rendition in *Iambus* 4. These include two apparent verbal parallels, which suggest that Callimachus may well have had some version of this particular fable in mind as a model for his much expanded version. It is important to recall not only the general interest in Aesop in, for example, Attic comedy, but also the Hellenistic interest. It is safe to assume that Callimachus, himself so much an antiquarian, had an interest in the collection of Aesopic fables assembled at Alexandria by Demetrius of Phalerum,[71] and indeed this may well account in part for the

71. Cf. B. E. Perry, "Demetrius of Phalerum and the Aesopic Fables," *TAPA* 93 (1962): 287–346. On the relationship of Callimachus to Demetrius, Perry observes (311–12): ". . . the book of Demetrius must have been the best known source and authority for Aesopic fables among the rhetoricians of the first and second centuries after Christ, as well as in the time of Callimachus, and no other collection of Aesopica in which these fables could have been found is known to us. There can be no certainty, however, concerning the provenience of these fables in any one case, since fables ascribed to Aesop's

prominent place of Aesop in the Callimachus' poetry. Aside from the obvious thematic similarities between the two fables here, the quarrel between the trees over an aspect of their benefits, the presence and self-intrusion of the bramble, there is one apparent verbal echo and one possible one. The first is the hortatory subjunctive παυσώμεθα, in each case the vehicle for the bramble's self-intrusion into the arena. The second possible echo I would suggest is that of the enclosure—ἐκ τοῦ πλησίον φραγμοῦ in the Aesopic fable. Pfeiffer indeed suggested for the lacuna at line 96 βάτος τὸ τρηχὺ τειχέων π̣. . δ. [.]υ̣α the word περίφραγμα; even the mention of the place of enclosure of the bramble in this tale set on Mt. Tmolus seems unoccasioned except as an echo of the enclosure in an earlier Aesopic version.

M. L. West has highlighted the similarities of the fable of *Iambus* 4 and a Babylonian tale of a similar dispute between the tamarisk and the palm.[72] The similarities of these two passages, with the god Apollo and his rites playing to a large extent in Callimachus' version the role of the king and his court in the Babylonian dispute, are truly remarkable. As West observes "there could hardly be a clearer case of the passage of Near Eastern material into Greek literature."[73] Animal fable, was a form of narrative shared by the variegated peoples of early Alexandria, imported from Greece and the Near East, and already indigenous in Egyptian literature.[74]

As he composed the fable of *Iambus* 4 Callimachus had several traditions before him, in all of which the structure of two entities debating their respected virtues was a given. The novelty of the fable of *Iambus* 4 lies in its content. Callimachus has incorporated into this traditional and popular structure a debate on aesthetics that is scholarly, detailed, and poetically self-referential. The poet, indeed, presents the fable

---

telling were presumably reported or mentioned in passing here and there by historians, poets and philosophers who wrote in the fourth century and in the Alexandrian age, and whose writings have not survived to us, just as they are reported in later authors, and in the works of Aristotle before the time of Demetrius. It is possible, therefore, that some of the odd fables . . . came from collections that we do not know, or from authors whose writings have been lost; but Demetrius is always the most probable source, because he published a collection of Aesopic fables and was widely known and respected as being among the foremost of Alexandrian scholars and collectors of cultural antiquities."

72. West (1969) 118–20. H. Diels (1910) 993–1002 first compared the two texts. A translation of the text of the Babylonian tale may be found in W. G. Lambert's *Babylonian Wisdom Literature,* (Oxford, 1960), 150 ff.

73. West (1969) 119. Babylonian sources for Aesopic fable is the subject of Antonio La Penna's study, "Letteratura esopica e letteratura assiro-babilonese," *RFIC* 92 (1964): 24–39.

74. On animal fable in late Egyptian literature see M. Lichtheim, *Ancient Egyptian Literature,* vol. 3, *The Late Period* (Berkeley, 1980), 156–57.

(lines 6–8) as part of the heritage of the ancient Near East ἔ̣ιν κοτε Τμώλῳ | δάφνην ἐλαίῃ νεῖικος οἱ πάλαι Λυδοί | λέγουσι θέσθαι καὶ γα[, thus at once providing a valorization for his narrative[75] and at the same time distancing his own voice from this tale, into which he then weaves many of his own artistic concerns. The fable, which the poet presents as an objective paradigm, is in fact a subjective statement. At the same time, in presenting this fable as a paradigm to the luckless son of Charitades the poet delineates what is in fact a quite complex and self-consciously literary discussion through the medium of simple popular narrative form. This is another example of one of the larger compositional motifs of this collection of poems as a whole—the elevation and elaboration of simpler utterance.

THE AGON

Assuming that line 13 ἐγὼ δὲ πάντων εἰμὶ τῶν δένδρων φαύλη is correctly placed here, this is the only surviving line of the olive's opening words in the poem. The line is emblematic of the olive's speech and demeanor—throughout gently self-deprecatory. That the laurel began the agon is indicated by the text at lines 7–8 and by the shaking of its boughs at line 10, a gesture that would precede an angry remark.

The Speech of the Laurel (lines 18–43)

The introductory lines of the agon survive only in fragmentary form. The initial voices of both speakers are lost. The continuous text takes up at line 22 in the laurel's long oration. Yet it is possible to discern in lines 18–21 several features of the laurel's rhetoric that will be consistent throughout the fable's narration and will be contrasted with the characteristics of the olive. The poet consistently associates with the laurel (1) an arrogant, even angry manner of demeanor and speech, (2) the derision of its opponent (line 18 ὤφρων ἐ̣[λαίη [foolish olive], repeated at 28 and 37–40, the olive by contrast is never rude to the laurel), and (3) heightened poetic expression (e.g. 20 ὁ̣ Δῆλον ο[ἰκέων [the one who dwells in Delos] for Apollo).

The laurel's long speech provides elaborate illustrations of these

75. This is a fairly common feature of Callimachean narrative, e.g. the careful references to the Cean historian Xenomedes in Callimachus' own version of the tale of Acontius and Cydippe (fr. 75 Pf.). At the same time this is, as West (1969) 118 observes, while not proof of the fable's non-Greek origin, quite possibly a real allusion to it given the parallels in e.g. the Babylonian dispute.

same features. In its tone, language, and choice of examples the laurel draws a distinction of status between itself and the olive. While referring to the olive's low appearance (22–23 both serpentine and slavish), its association with the unseemly (37–43 suffering and death), and its low place (42 in being trod by mortal foot), the laurel draws to itself the attributes of reverence by mortals, close association with the divine, and presence at festival and dance. The self-description in the laurel's speech has marked hymnic overtones, particularly in the anaphora (26–27 δάφνῃ . . . δάφνην . . . δάφνην), the repetition of terms of praise (37 and 39 ἱρὴ γάρ εἰμι . . . ἁγνὴ γάρ εἰμι) and most strikingly perhaps in the phrase δάφνην δ' ἀείδει at line 27. The mythological tale that the laurel appropriates to illustrate its own heroic nature is that of the seer Branchus, the founder of the cult of Apollo at Didyma, curing the Milesians (here referred to in epic fashion as οἱ παῖδες οἱ τῶν Ἰώνων) of the plague. The healing of a populace of a plague brought on by the wrath of Apollo is known to have been the topic of elevated verse,[76] as well as being a central motif of Callimachus fr. 229 Pf.

By contrast the laurel denigrates the olive through associations of low imagery (lines 22–23):

> ὡριστερὸς μὲν λευκὸς ὡς ὕδρου γαστήρ,
> ὁ δ' ἡλιοπλὴξ ὃς τὰ [π]ολλὰ γυμνοῦται.
>
> Your left side is white like the belly of a water snake,
> and the other, which is most often uncovered, sunburned.

The laurel's characterization of her opponent operates on two levels. In terms of poetic imagery the laurel associates the olive with the low. The word γαστήρ, the comparison and the vivid anthropomorphizing of the olive as slave (the ἐξωμίς is a slave's cloak which exposed the right arm and shoulder)[77] are all features that contrast with the laurel's hymnic self-representation. In terms of social status the laurel, by casting the olive in a slavish garb, underscores its own elevated position. The casting of the olive as slave, and slavish in appearance, has its own complex dynamic. The laurel, closely associated with Apollo (the references to the Pythia, Branchus and the *Daphnephoria* at Delphi all underscore this association), engages in debate with the olive, represented as "slavish," which narrates a fable of two birds with animal voices (line 63 πάλαι in the narrative of the olive recalls line 7 πάλαι in the narrative of the poet, each at the introduction of the reported

76. By Apollodorus of Corcyra; see Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 5.8.48.

77. Cf. A. *Wasps* 443–44 οὐδὲν τῶν πάλαι μεμνημένοι | διφθερῶν κἀξωμίδων, ἃς οὗτος αὐτοῖς ἠμπόλα [not mindful of the leather coats and shirts he once bought for them].

"fable"). This opposition may allude to a number of features of Aesop himself, even though he does not appear by name in the extant poem. Aesop was, of course, represented as a former slave, he narrated animal fable, and in some traditions engaged in competition with Apollo.[78] Some scholars have read this competition as especially one between aristocratic and popular/rustic culture to appropriate narrative voice and narrative legitimacy. This last is, I would suggest, very much present in *Iambus* 4. The agon of the two trees is clearly one of poetic style, level, and content, debated in part in terms of Callimachus' own poetry. The Aesopic style is that of the olive.

Other features of the laurel's speech evoke both traditional iambic and Callimachean poetics. Line 31 ἀρτεμέαc appears to recall Hippon. fr. 105 W. (108 Deg.) line 6 Βάραγχος ἀρτεμ̣[. D'Alessio[79] suggests that Hipponax may be alluding to the same part of the myth. In any event this appears to be a pointed allusion on the laurel's (and Callimachus') part to a poet and a theme closely associated with Lydia (already prefigured in lines 6–7 ἔ̣ιν κοτε Τμώλῳ̣ . . . οἱ πάλαι Λυδοί). The narrator of *Iambus* 4 transfers a fable from archaic Ionia to an Alexandrian (and specifically Callimachean) context, a fable that at the same time encodes its archaic narration by an archaic poet. In the same speech the laurel evokes the contemporary poetic context of Callimachean poetics at line 39 κοὐ πατεῦcί μ'ἄνθρωποι [and men do not tread upon me]. Callimachus uses the verb πατέω elsewhere in the context of the popular rather than the select, in Apollo's injunction to the poet in lines 25–28 of the *Aetia* prologue:

πρὸc δέ cε] καὶ τόδ' ἄνωγα, τὰ μὴ πατέουcιν ἄμαξαι
τὰ cτείβεJιν, ἑτέρων ἴχνια μὴ καθ' ὁμά
δίφρον ἐλ]ᾶ̣ν μηδ' οἶ̣μον ἀνὰ πλατύν, ἀλλὰ κελεύθουc
ἀτρίπτο]υ̣c, εἰ καὶ cτειιι̣νοτέρην ἐλάcειc.'

And this too I charge you, do not tread the paths which carriages
trample, do not drive your chariot along the common tracks of others,
nor along the broad road, but untrodden paths,
although you will drive a narrower course.'

In her speech the laurel establishes a distinction between the two trees of rite, association, and character. The laurel is Apollo's, an attendant of rites of oracle, game, and popular celebration. The laurel's sacral nature is based on absence of suffering; the tree has no association with death. The laurel characterizes the olive with the opposite of each of these el-

78. See Jedrkiewicz (1989) 85–86, 91–94.
79. D'Alessio (1996) 605, n. 71.

ements. The olive is part of funerary rites, is symbolic of suffering and death, and is associated with humans and their bodies. The repetition of verbal imagery heightens the points of difference. Below the Pythia is strewn laurel (line 27 δάφνην . . . ὑπέcτρωται), humans lay corpses on strewn olive branches (line 43 τοῦ μὴ πνέοντ[οc . . .]παξ ὑπ[έ]c̣τ[ρωcαν), the victory-crown at the Pythian games is of laurel (line 33 γίνομαι δὲ κἄεθλον). The olive responds in the same terms. The olive begins with a defense of the very features the laurel derides, effectively turning derision to praise, and doing so in part through the recitation of fable.

The Speech of the Olive (lines 46–92)

The introductory characterization of the laurel at the opening of its speech is lost to us; we have, however, that of the olive, a line that turns out to be characteristic of the olive's apologia as a whole. Lines 44–45 τὴν δ' ἀπήλ̣[λαξε | μάλ' ἀτρεμαίωc ἡ τεκοῦcα τὸ χρῖμ[α [but she who gave birth to oil replied to the laurel very quietly] calls the attention of the poem's audience already to the reformulative nature of the olive's speech. In sound ἀτρεμαίωc recalls line 31 ἀρτεμέαc, here the positive heroic quality of the laurel's narrative drawn homonymously to its opponent, the olive. ἡ τεκοῦcα τὸ χρῖμ[α has a similar quality of semantic play; the seemingly quiet, understated characterization has a parallel in Athena's simple adornment at *Hymn* 5.26 χρίματα, τᾶc ἰδίαc ἔκγονα φυταλιᾶc [unguents, the produce of her own growing]. The olive, too, is redolent of the divine.

While the speech of the olive is not without its own share of divine association and elevated occasion, several elements in this speech deliberately highlight the simple in contrast to the grand imagery of the laurel. The crows' chatter, the speaker's mock deprecation of their babbling, and the conceit of the trees' rhetorical agon figured as a true show of athletic prowess, a wrestling match, are all touches that contrast with the grandeur of the laurel's heroic catalog. Some of the vocabulary is drawn from decidedly unelevated sources; the humorous denomination of Poseidon as ὁ φυκίοικοc [the seaweed dweller] and the humble sorts of food the olive provides (c̣τ[έμφυλο]ν line 76 for example is found almost entirely in comedy). The two mythological references that the birds provide are especially arresting in this regard. The contest of Athena and Poseidon[80] (lines 66–68) for the hegemony of Athens is a lighter heroic theme than the wrath of Apollo, and potentially subject of a dif-

80. Also a theme of Callimachus' *Hecale*; cf. fr. 70.10–11 Hollis = 260.25–26 Pf.

ferent narrative type. The olive Theseus washed down at Hecale's hut (line 77) is a different kind of heroic moment than Branchus' healing of the masses. In contrast to the laurel, the olive chooses a lighter language of self-representation, and a smaller speaker of its virtues. The Pythia sings of the laurel, two chattering birds narrate the olive's virtues.

The rhetorical structure of the two speeches is chiastic, with some variation.[81] The olive responds first to the last claim of the laurel, and underlines in her ironic opening address that she is doing so (lines 46–48). She then turns to the laurel's association with the divine; this in part the olive answers (lines 57–59), and in part illustrates with the comments of the two birds. The two birds have multiple significance. They represent fable, and the olive presents them in the manner of fable introduction (line 63 πάλαι κάθηνται). They are arbiters of a metaphorical agon; the references to the wrestling fall of the laurel mark the metaphorical nature of the contest. They are seemingly unbiased judges of the larger rhetorical agon of the two trees. At the same time the olive assumes their voices, just as the poem's narrator does those of the two trees; the olive comments on the birds' garrulity (line 63 κωτίλον δὲ τὸ ζεῦγος, and lines 81–82) as the narrator of *Iambus* 4 characterizes the manner of speaking of each of his protagonists.

The moment of victory in the birds' fable is the olive's usefulness to humanity. The trees are equally honored in divine terms (lines 70–72), but the laurel provides no fruit for human use (line 74 μήτ' ἔσθε μήτε πῖνε μήτ' ἐπιχρίσῃ [neither eat nor drink of it nor rub it on]). The olive is the branch that suppliants hold before them (lines 79–80). The birds' final comment at line 91 οὔτ' ἐπὶ φλιῆς corresponds to the laurel's rhetorical question at line 24 τίς δ' οἶκος οὗπερ [ο]ὐκ ἐγὼ παρὰ φλιῇ; Line 92 φ]ημι τὴν δάφνην [I assert the laurel], the final comment of the chattering birds, concludes the olive's speech that began at line 46 ὦ πάντα καλή, as apparently the laurel's speech began and concluded with specific references to her opponent.

The Bramble

Infuriated by the olive's response, the laurel is on the verge of taking up the debate again, when a nearby bramble intervenes. The bramble is the equivalent figure in the fable of *Iambus* 4 to the poem's addressee, the son of Charitades, the figure whom, according to the diegete, the poet characterizes as both Θρᾷξ and παιδοκλέπτης. In a suggestive study

81. See Clayman (1978/79) 146–47.

on the significance of the bramble E. Lelli has proposed that the bramble is an allegorical representation of a traditionalist or homericist poet, one completely alien to a dialogue on Callimachean poetics.[82] It is certainly the case that the agon of the two trees is developed partly in terms of Callimachus' own works. The laurel's response to the bramble is that of an invective poet: line 102 ὦ κακὴ λώβη casts the bramble effectively as the object of invective. The laurel's outraged response at the bramble's intervention (line 101 τὴν δ' ἆρ' ὑποδρὰξ οἷα ταῦροϲ ἡ δάφνη [The laurel looked at her from under her brow like a bull]) heightens this. The image is a grand one of tragedy.[83] The use of the language of tragedy further underscores the character of the agon as one of poetic style.

P. Oxy. 1011 fol. 5 r ends with the reference to Cybele at lines 105–6, which recalls the fable's Lydian setting (line 6). Two smaller papyrus fragments supply several fragmentary lines from a later part of the poem, apparently the epilogue. It is unclear how many lines are missing between line 106 (where we are still in the fable) and line 107. The masculine ἀλλήλουϲ (line 107) is the first of several elements in these final lines that indicate that the focus of this part of the poem is now the (male) characters of the frame. The reflexive pronoun may also indicate an agon. The concluding lines of the Diegesis to *Iambus* 1, some part of which is a citation from the text, include the ἀλλήλων at the end of line 20. The context in *Iambus* 1 is clearly an eristic setting. If we assume the fragmentary closing lines evoke an agonistic setting, ἥδιϲτοϲ and χείρων (lines 110 and 112) are both evaluative judgments.

Conclusion

In *Iambus* 2 Callimachus transfers an Aesopic fable to contemporary Alexandria, subsuming his contemporaries into the fable's narrative. In *Iambus* 4 the poet takes his audience back to archaic Asia Minor, but the agon at the fable's center is carried out largely in contemporary poetic terms. One of the outstanding features of both poems is the explicit use of the cultural authority of the past to validate the poet's voice. In his use of fable as paradigm Callimachus borrows the past to comment on the present.

82. E. Lelli, "La figura del rovo nel Giambo IV di Callimaco," *RCCM* 38 (1996): 314–18. Lelli would read Callimachean literary polemic on two levels; one of adherence to a new poetic, and one of the manner of its practice.

83. Cf. Eur. *Med.* 92 ὄμμα . . . ταυρουμένην, 187–88 δέργμα . . . ἀποταυροῦται; Aristophanes is playing on this in Aeschylus' look in the agon with Euripides at *Frogs* 804 ἔβλεψε . . . ταυρηδόν.

FIVE

Ethical Behavior

Iambi 3 and 5

Ethical criticism is a cornerstone of archaic iambic poetry. As a medium for *psogos,* censure,[1] archaic iambic frequently assumes a triadic structure of (1) the censuring poetic voice, (2) the censured individual, and (3) an audience that both shares the judgments of the censurer and is itself the arena for the shaming of the censured.[2] This poetry of *psogos,* from the earliest surviving examples to its Roman emulators, may show at the same time seriousness and aspects that inspire laughter. The seriousness, the corrective and sometimes damaging nature of censure, may vary depending on the tone and degree of involvement of the speaker. The humor often results from the language and figures of iambic poetry, imagery of the base, or vulgar diction. The striking characteristic of much iambic blame poetry is that these contrary levels of tone do not work against but with one another, and the seriousness of an ethical message is not necessarily lessened by nonserious coloring, but is even underscored by it.

An awareness of the merging of different tones is essential for an appreciation of blame poetry and of its evolution at the hands of the Hellenistic poets. These writers had before them a tradition of a poetry in which a serious or semi-serious underlying theme might be cloaked in the nonserious. They manipulate this tradition to meet the ethical concerns of their own period.

Two of Callimachus' *Iambi,* 3 and 5, are the subject of this chapter. Both poems comprise criticism of sexual behavior, and, as such, follow a tradition of which we perceive traces in Archilochus and Hipponax. Both also demonstrate variation from that tradition in ways that are characteristic of their different era.

1. For a general introduction to the character and social setting of blame poetry see Nagy (1979) 211–75.

2. On the social construct of blame poetry see Gentili (1988) 107–14, Nagy (1979) 243–45.

Iambus 3 (fr. 193 Pf.)

Εἰ̈ʃθ’ ἦν, ἄ̣ινα̣ξ̣ʃ ὤπολλον, ἠνίκ’ οὐκ ἦα
]αι· καὶ cὺ κάρτ’ ε̣[.]. μᾶcθε
]`[ ]. [ ]. ζεν·
[ ]
]. [ ]. . υτηc
]. ιc αὐτ’ ἐποίηcεν
]νερθε δεῖ κεῖcθαι
]λιcτι δ’ οἰκεῦμεν
] ζόη μετέcτραπται
]α Φοῖβε, ληκῆcαι̣
]ον· οὐντραφεὶc δ’ ὑμῖν
] ἐκεῖνοc ὤνθρωποc
α]ἰ̣ κακαὶ ψῆφοι
]ονοιτ’ ἀνάccο]ντεc
]ε̣ δεξιῇ τρώγειν
]λέγουcι τὰ πρῶτα·
]α̣c με· φεῦ· τὸν ἄκληρο̣[ν
ἐ]πείπερ ἥμαρτεc
]δε. λαcτ. . . ρεξ. [
]. πολλ̣ά̣κι̣c. . . . . [
]ρ̣. . . [.]. . [.]. c

Text: *P. Oxy.* 1011 preserves lines 1–13 and 24–39, *P. Oxy.* 2215 fr. 1 lines 5–24. Line 1 is also preserved by the Diegesis.

Meter: stichic choliambic.

Dialect: literary Ionic.

2]αι· καὶ cὺ κάρτ’ ε̣[.]. μᾶcθε It has been suggested that the opening of *Iambus* 3 may have contained a similar evocation of Apollo and the Muses as the opening line of *Iambus* 13. Dawson (1950) 33 suggests that the second line read ὅθ’ αἵ τε Μοῦcαι καὶ cὺ κάρτ’ ἐτιμᾶcθε; cf. Dawson (1946) 4, where he also draws the parallel of *Iambus* 13.1. P. Maas conjectured εἴ θην—φίλαι τε Μοῦc]αι καὶ cὺ κάρτ’ ἐ̣[τι]μᾶcθε (PRIMI 1:162). The reading ἐ̣[τι]μᾶcθε at the end of line 2 is possible (R. Coles). Yet assuming more here seems incautious. There is clearly a dot before the και in the papyrus that looks very much like a half-stop rather than vestigial ink or a residual mark of a stroke crossing the vertical bar of the κ. Pfeiffer prints this in his text as a half-stop; it certainly resembles other half-stops in the papyrus. Dawson’s reading consciously ignores this. There is no ink following μᾶcθε.

If we with Dawson read ἐτιμᾶcθε we need another nominative for the second person plural verb, and the Muses are certainly a frequent presence in the *Iambi,* as is the pairing of Apollo and the Muses in Callimachus. (The ὑμῖν of line 11 may lend some support to this reading, as the speaker of the poem is still, or again,

O, would, Lord Apollo, I were, when I was not
]αι· and you very much ε̣[.] . μᾶcθε
]`[ ]. [ ]. ζεν·
[ ]
]. [ ]. . υτηc
]. ιc made the same things
]νερθε should lie
]λιcτι but we dwell
] life is turned around
]α Phoebus, to screw around
]ον · the one brought up among you
] that man
]the evil resolutions
]ονοιτ' ruling
]ε to eat with the right hand
]they say first of all·
]α̣c me - alas - without a share
]since you erred
]δ̣ε. λ̣αcτ. . . ρεξ. [
]. frequently. . . . . [
]ρ̣. . . [.]. . [.]. c

addressing Apollo [Φοῖβε line 10] at this point.) The effect would be a close identification of plaintive poetic voice with his divine patrons, an identification that recurs in serio-comic fashion in the final lines.

5]. . υτηc Pfeiffer (app. crit.) sees traces of an accent mark over the υ, and suggests ἐ]λλύτηc.

8 λιcτι Hunt (ed. princ.) thought διcτι possible.

13 α]ἰ κακαὶ ψῆφοι Cf. the Hesiodic parallel *Works and Days* 221. Dawson 1950 ambitiously reconstructs the sense of these lines to be a denunciation of the discovery (and discoverer) of precious metals, and to include as well at least one reference to a lost "golden age" with line 15 δεξιῇ τρώγειν. While some of his discussion is persuasive, this is too elaborate a reconstruction to draw from the extant text.

14]ονοιτ' ἀνάcc[ο]ντε[c Perh.]ον · οἵ τ' ἄν (cf. 12 ὥνθρωποc, 13 α]ἰ κακαί), Bulloch.

15 δεξιῇ Pfeiffer thought of the right hand given in oath (ad loc. ("aut de fide, cuius testis est dextera"); cf. Eur. *Med.* 21–22 ἀνακαλεῖ δὲ δεξιᾶc | πίcτιν μεγίcτην). This certainly seems to be the sense of the same word several lines later in this poem (line 27 . .]δεξιὴν ἔδωκεν κ. πα. . c̣πλάγχνα̣ | . [. .]ν ἐν ἰραῖc εἶπεν [ἡμέ]ραιc ἥκειν | καὶ γαμβρὸν̣ . . . ω̣ . . . α[.]φίλο̣ν θέcθαι, where the theme of broken trust is an integral part of the story of Euthydemus' abandonment of the poet.

]τη. . ο. . .
]. ο̣cεν[ ]. . .
. . . . .]c, ὥ̣c̣[π]ερ Εὐθύδημον ἡ μήτηρ
. . . .]. ανα. νυν οὐδὲ πῦρ ἐναύουcιν
. . .]χαῖρ᾽ ἔφηcα. [.]. ι̣ν. λ̣ῷ̣ [c]υναντήcαc
. .]δ̣εξιὴν ἔδ̣ωκε κ. πα. . c̣π̣λάγχνα̣
. [. .]ν ἐν ἱραῖc εἶπεν [ἡμέ]ραιc ἥκειν
καὶ γαμβρὸν̣ . . . ω̣ . . . α[.]φίλο̣ν θέcθαι
. . υ̣[. .]. . χε̣. [.]ν̣ κρηγύωc ἐπαιδεύθην
. . [ἐ]φρόνηcα τὠγαθὸν βλέψαι
]τε̣ καὶ θεοὺc ἀπρηγεῦνταc
]. . μόχθηροc ἐξεκνήμωc . [
]. ν μοι τοῦτ᾽ ἂν ἦν ὀνήϊc[το]ν̣
.]υ̣[.]. [.]Κ̣[υβή]βη̣ τὴν κόμην ἀναρρίπτειν
Φρ̣ύγ[α] πρ̣[ὸc] αὐλὸν ἢ ποδῆρεc ἕλκοντα̣
Ἄδω[ν]ιν αἰαῖ, τῆc θεοῦ τὸν ἄνθρωπον,
ἰηλεμίζειν· ν̣ῦν δ᾽ ὁ μάργοc ἐc Μούcαc
ἔ̣νευcα· τοίγα̣[ρ] ἦν ἔμαξα δει[πν]ή̣cω.

25 οὐδὲ πῦρ ἐναύουcιν The papyrus has εναύουcιν here, and the rough breathing is very clear (S. A. Stephens kindly checked the papyrus reading at Oxford for me). It is not uncommon in papyri and ancient grammarians to mark internal aspiration (I would like to thank G. B. D'Alessio for pointing this out to me).

27 πα R. Coles doubted this reading.

29 γαμβρόν̣ Von Arnim proposed καὶ γαμβρὸν̣ [ἠξί]ω̣[cε κ]α[ὶ] φίλο̣ν θέcθαι. The καί is very attractive, as it sets γαμβρὸν̣ and φίλο̣ν in apposition with the poetic narrator or Euthydemus. ἀξιόω is not a verb Callimachus employs elsewhere in his extant verse.

31 . . [ ]φρόνηcα Not necessarily ἐ]φρόνηcα (as Pfeiffer) since ἐcω]φρόνηcα is also possible, so Lloyd-Jones.

33 μόχθηροc μόχθηροc in the papyrus. On the accentuation of this adjective the ancient grammarians are in disagreement; some preferring to accent the active sense, "wretch," i.e, "base" as oxytone μοχθηρός and the passive sense "wretch," i.e, "misfortunate" as proparoxytone μόχθηροc. See Pfeiffer's commentary for references, LSJ, s.v. μοχθηρός.

33 ἐξεκνήμωc. [Cf. Hippon, fr. 95.9 W. (98 Deg.) πιαρεκνημοῦντιο, a *hapax legomenon,* as is ἐξεκνήμωc[α]. On the former see Degani's comments in his notes ad loc. κ]ατεῖλε[at line 12 of the same fragment may be worth noting here. While it is very difficult to derive a coherent sense of this very broken Hipponax fragment, the repetition of the name Bupalus (thrice in some 17 lines) is suggestive cer-

]τη. . ο. . .
]. ο̣cεν[ ]. . .
. . . . .]c, just as his mother Euthydemus
. . . .]. ανα . νυν nor do they light fire
. . .]greetings I said. [.]. ι̣ν. λ̣ῷ̣ on meeting with him
. .]he gave his right hand κ. πα . . . c̣π̣λάγχνα̣
. [. .]ν said he had come on the holy days
and his suitor . . . ω̣ . . . α[.] friend to make
. . υ̣[. .]. . χε̣. [.]ν̣ I was honorably brought up
. . [ ]it was my intention to look to the good
]τ̣ε̣ and the gods doing nothing
]. . wretch destroyed. [
]. ν this would have been best for me
.]υ̣[.]. [.]to cast back my hair for Kybebe
to Phrygian flute or dragging my ankle-length robe
to cry, alas Adonis, follower of the goddess.
But now, a horny madman, I have inclined to the Muses.
Therefore that which I have kneaded I shall dine upon.

tainly of invective. Hipponax elsewhere faults a woman for sexual involvement with Bupalus (frr. 12 W. [20 Deg.], 15 W. [18 Deg.]).

36 Φρ̣ύγα πρ[ὸc] αὐλὸν Cf. Tib. 1.4.70 *et secet ad Phrygios vilia membra modos.*

39 τοίγα̣[ρ] ἢν ἔμαξα δει[πν]ήc̣ω Traditionally commentators have pointed to the proverb ἤν τιc ἔμαξε μᾶζαν, ταύτην καὶ ἐcθιέτω (Macarius, *Paroemiographi Graeci* II 171), "the bread one has kneaded, let him also eat it." Both Knox, "On Editing Hipponax: A Palinode?" *SIFC, n.s.*, 15, (1938) 196 and Dawson (1950) 38 have argued strongly for this interpretation, and there are certainly two pieces of evidence which give some support to this suggestion. Callimachus *does* integrate proverbs into his poetic text elsewhere: e.g. *Iambus* 5.1–2 cυμβουλὴ | ιγὰρ ἔν τι τῶν ἱρῶν and ἄκουε τἀπὸ καρδ̣ι̣[ίηc], fr. 75.9 ὡc ἐτεὸν παῖc ὄδε μαῦλιν ἔχει. There is also μᾶζα at *Iambus* 5.7. The imagery of food, especially of a humbler variety, belongs very much to the realm of traditional iambic; cf. Hippon. fr. 8 W. (28 Deg.) κἀφῆι παρέξειν ἰσχάδας τε καὶ μᾶζαν | καὶ τυρόν, οἷον ἐσθίουσι φαρμακοί.

On the final three syllables Pfeiffer (following the sense of the proverb) notes that δειπνήc̣ω cannot be read with certainty, and prints δεν[. .]. c̣ω. A computer enhancement of the end of the line suggests that the apparent [ν] in δεν may well be ι̣, in which case δειπνήc̣ω is all but certain (I thank L. Koenen for assistance with this). Cf. *Hy.* 5.115 δειπνηcεῦντι.

VI

33 Εἴθ’ ἦν, ἄναξ ὤπολλον, ἡνίκ’ οὐκ ἦα
Καταμέμφεται τὸν καιρὸν ὡc πλούτου
35 μᾶλλον ἢ ἀρετῆc ὄντα, τὸν δὲ
πρὸ αὐτοῦ ἀποδέχεται ὃc τῆc ἐναν-
τίαc ἦν τούτων γνώμηc· παρεπι-
κόπτει δὲ καὶ Εὐθύδημόν τινα, ὡc
κεχρημένον τῇ ὥρᾳ πορικμῷ, ὑ-
40 πὸ τῆc μητρὸc πλουcίῳ cυcταθέντα.

"O, would, Lord Apollo, I were, when I was not"
He censures the era as one of wealth
rather than virtue, and approves the one
before this, which was of the opposite
frame of mind than these men (i.e. his contemporaries).
And he reproves further a certain Euthydemus,
on the grounds that he makes use of his beauty for profit,
when he is presented by his mother to a rich man.

Iambus 5 (fr. 195 Pf.)

ʽΩ ξεῖνε—cυμβουλὴ | ιγὰρ ἔν τι τῶν ἱρῶν—
ἄκουε τἀπὸ καρδ̣ι̣[ίηc,]
ἐπεί cε δαίμων ἄλφα βῆτ̣ι̣[α]
οὐχ ὡc ὀνήιcτον. ι[ ]
ἀλλ᾽ οἷον ἄνδρ̣[α] c̣υ̣ι̣[ ]. . ω̣ν̣. . . π̣ω̣ν̣
καὶ c. ι[ ].
ἔ]δ̣ω̣κει[ ]. ε. η μᾶζα·
. . . .]. α
]. ι̣λεο̣χρη̣ . .
]ε. ἐργάτην·
]μνειν κὴξ ὄρευc ἄγειν ὕλην
]. . ιμαινε̣. π̣άϊc·
]. c̣τ̣ηρ ἐc θάλαccαν ἐμβαίνειν
]λ̣λα φρονέων
]. [.]. . . [.]. [.]ων ἐ̣παυρήcειc
]. . παθευμεν̣. . .
]ν ἀλγέων̣ μηδὲ γούνατα κλ̣ί̣ν̣ω̣ν̣
]ν ἄccα τοι λ̣[έγ]ω·
]. . βουν·. . . . ν̣α̣τ̣ῳ̣ ποδὶ τ̣ρ̣έ̣ψ̣η̣
]κεραυνώcη̣[. .]. . .
]. ον μαcτὸ[ν]. . . [.]κ̣ειν̣ωθη
ὣc̣ ̣ δ᾽ ἄν cε θωϊὴ λάβοι·
τὸ πῦρ δὲ τὠνέκαυcαc, ἄχριc ο̣ὐ̣ πολλῇ̣

Text: *PSI* 1216 preserves lines 1–68; 1–7 are additionally preserved by *P. Ryl.* 485, *P. Oxy.* 2171 has 54–63. *P. Oxy.* 2171 fr. 1, 1–9 preserves as well the end of nine verses between lines 35 and 53; Pfeiffer also thought frr. 210 and 213 might belong to this poem.

Meter: epodic, choliambic lines alternating with iambic dimeter.

Dialect: literary Ionic.

4 ὀνήιcτον cf. *Iambus* 3.34 ὀνήϊc[το]ν̣. This is one of several moments of verbal similarity in the two poems.

7 μᾶζα Perhaps the subject of ἔ]δ̣ω̣κε rather than the object of another construction, as Dawson (1950) 57 seems to assume. There is a parallel in ἣν ἔμαξα of *Iambus* 3.39. μᾶζα can have an erotic sense; it is not clear whether the erotic atmosphere at the end of *Iambus* 3 is also at play here.

9] . ι̣λεο̣χρη̣ Poss. ε̣ι̣λεο̣ χρη̣μ̣η̣ι̣, Griffin; χρη̣μ̣, Vitelli (Parsons).

11 κὴξ, Parsons doubted this. Poss. κηφ = i.e. κ᾽εἰ φορεύc.

12]. . ιμαινε̣. π̣άϊc Norsa-Vitelli suggested ἐ]π̣οίμαινε̣c which would be in apposition to πάϊc "as a boy you shepherded." Pfeiffer thought the π too unclear. The verb ποιμαίνειν means primarily "to shepherd"; it is used, however, also metaphori-

O Friend—for advice is something sacred—
hear that from my heart]
since a spirit that you the alphabet]
not as best . ⟦[ ]
but as a man ⟦[ ]. . ⟦ω⟧. . . ⟦π⟧ω⟧
and ⟦c. ⟧[ ].
granted ⟦[ ] . ε. η bread;
. . . .]. α
]. ⟦ι⟧λε⟦ο⟧χρη. .
]ε ⟦.⟧ laborer.
]μνειν and bring wood from the mountain
]. . ιμαινε⟦.⟧ boy;
]. ⟦ς⟧τηρ to embark on the sea
]⟦λ⟧λα thinking
]. [.]. . . [.]. [.]ων you will have enjoyment
]. . παθευμε⟦ν⟧. . .
]ν suffering nor bending your knees
]ν whatever I tell you;
]. . βουν·. . . ν⟦α⟧τῳ turn with your foot
] struck with a thunderbolt [. .]. . .
]. ον breast . . . [.] emptied
so could punishment overtake you.
But the fire which you have set alight, as long as it has not

cally in erotic contexts, e.g. Theocr. *Id.* 11.80–81 Οὕτω τοι Πολύφαμος ἐποίμαινεν τὸν ἔρωτα | μουσίσδων, ῥᾴον δὲ διᾶγ' ἢ εἰ χρυσὸν ἔδωκεν (see Gow's comments to these lines). Cf. also (with different sense but enclosed in an erotic context) Luc. *Am.* 54 Ἐμοὶ μὲν οὕτω παιδεραστεῖν γένοιτο· μετεωρολέσχαι δὲ καὶ ὅσοι φιλοσοφίας ὀφρὺν ὑπὲρ αὐτοὺς τοὺς κροτάφους ὑπερήρκασιν, σεμνῶν ὀνομάτων κομψεύμασιν τοὺς ἀμαθεῖς ποιμαινέτωσαν.

13]. ⟦ς⟧τηρ ἐ⟦c⟧ θάλα⟦cc⟧αν ἐμβαίνειν The τ in ⟦ς⟧τηρ (*PSI* 1216 col. 1 line 18 *init.*) is fairly certain, hence we expect a nominative subject of the infinitive ἐμβαίνειν; cf. note to line 11.

14]⟦λ⟧λα φρονέων If ἀλλά is read the phrase could be adversative. ἐπαυρήc⟦ει⟧c in the following line need not be a negative sense (so Dawson "you will endure," D'Alessio "soffrirai"); cf. Herod. 3.2 τῆς ζοῆς τ' ἐπαυρέσθαι [to enjoy life].

16]. . παθευμε⟦ν⟧. . . Poss. παθευμε⟦νοι⟧ Parsons.

19]. . βουν·. . . . ν⟦α⟧τῳ ποδὶ τ⟦ρ⟧έψῃ μὴ ⟦α⟧να etc. Parsons (μη conf., α and later τ⟦ρ⟧εψη very dub.).

πρόcω κεχώρηκεν φλογί,
ἀλλ᾽ ἀτρεμίζει κὴπὶ τὴν τέφρην᾽ οἰ̣[χ]ν̣εῖ,
κ̣οίμηcον. ἴcχε δὲ δρόμιου
μαργῶνταc ἵππουc μηδὲ δευτέριηιν̣ κ̣ά̣μ̣ψῃc,
μή τοι περὶ νύccῃ δίφριον
ἄξωcιν, ἐκ δὲ κύμβαχιοc κυβιcητήcῃc.
ἆ, μή με ποιήcῃ γέ[λω.
ἐγὼ Βάκιc τοι καὶ Cίβυλλα [καὶ] δάφνη
καὶ φηγόc. ἀλλὰ cυμβαλεῦ
τᾠ̃νιγμα, καὶ μὴ Πιτθέωc ἔχε χρείην·
. . . .]τι καὶ κωφεῖ λόγοc. 195 a
ἐγὼ̣[[ends of nine verses
τὸν̣ π̣α̣[between lines 35 and 53]
μη. ο̣ι̣ακα. [. . . .
cυμ̣παιζ[ ] . αι . ετ̣αc[
και. . νε . [ ]. . ι̣·
ὡc μητ . [ ]δ̣υτοκαιμου[
δέ̣λ̣τ̣οι γὰρ[ ]
εἰ δ᾽, ὦνα. . . [ ]. . [.]ε̣. η̣[
καί τ̣οι δοκέω. [ ]
ἐπαντι. . . [ ]. . . προκη. . [
ἄ̣θ̣υμοc οὐδ̣[ ]ταλαν
εμευμενεc[ ]π̣. ρ̣ήκου̣cα[
τῶν εἴ̈ τι π. [. . . .
μηδ᾽ ὅccον. [
οὔτ᾽ εἶδον· ο̣υ̣. [
ὀθνεῖα γειν̣. [
ὄψεαί με δ̣υc[
ποιεῦντ̣α̣ το[
θ̣. . . ων̣ . . . [. . . .
ἔλαυνε· μη. [ ]. [
οὐδ᾽ οὐμὸc . [ ]λ̣[
λιπηcαδ̣υ . [ ]

25 κὴπὶ τὴν τέφρην̣ For ἐπί + acc. cf. *Iambus* 4 line 54, Parsons.
25 οἰ̣[χ]ν̣εῖ οἴκει, Parsons. ο̣ι̣[χ]ν̣ει very dub. Parsons. ? οἰκεῖ.
30 ποιήcῃ ποιήcῃ rather than ποιήcῃc; see D'Alessio (1996) 617, n. 101 (the correction is A. Kerkhecker's, cited by D'Alessio).
34 λόγοc λόγον, Parsons.
Fr. 195a, 3]δ̣υτοκαιμου[Perhaps]δ̣υτο καὶ μοῦ̣[cαι; cf. *Iambus* 13 line 22 line end α̣ι̣ Μοῦ̣c̣α̣ι.

progressed further with much flame,
but lies still and dwells in the ashes,
quench it. And hold from their racing
your raving horses, nor guide them the second part,
lest around the turning post they shatter your chariot
and you tumble out headlong.
Ah, do not make me an object of laughter.
I am your Bakis and your Sibyl and your laurel
and your oak. But interpret
this riddle, and have no need of Pittheus.
. . . .]τι and speech for a deaf man. 195a

I[[the ends of nine verses
τὸν̣ π̣α̣[between lines 35 and 53]
μη . ο̣ι̣ακα . [. . . .
play with[ ]. αι. ετα꜀[
και. . νε. [ ]. . ι̣·
ὡ꜀ μητ. [ ]δ̣υτοκαιμου[
for writing-tablets[ ]
but if, ὦ̃να. . . [5]. . [.]ε̣ . η̣[
and indeed I seem. [ ]
ἐπαντι. . . [ ]. . . προκη. . [
spiritless οὐδ̣[ ]ταλαν
εμευμενε꜀[ ]π̣. ρ̣ήκου̣꜀α[
τῶν εἴ τι π.[. . . .
not as much. [
nor saw I. ο̣υ̣. [
foreign γειν̣. [
you will see me δ̣υ꜀[
doing το[
θ̣ . . . ων̣ . . . [. . . .
was driving. μη. [ ]. [
nor even my . [ ]λ̣[
λιπη꜀αδ̣υ. [ ]

πέμπουcιν[ ]μη̣[.]ο̣νεινεπ̣α̣ç̣[.]ν̣α̣[ ]
φεῦ ταῦ̣τ̣α̣[ ]ç̣·
ἔμπηc. . [ ]. αιχα. . . μ. ç̣εων
. . . ευφ[ ]
. . . . [ ]. πολ. . [.]c. . [ ]
ψήφ. . . [. . .]ί. . [ ]. [
. . ε. . [.]ç̣η. . . . . [ ]. α[
ἔκφα̣. [. . . .
ηcη̣τ̣ο̣. . [
ηδεcμ. [
καὶ φιμὸν[
ωγηcε. . [

Diegesis to *Iambus 5*

VII

19 ῾Ω ξεῖνε—cυμβουλὴ γ[ὰ]ρ̣ ἔν τι τῶν ἱρῶν—
20 Γραμματο[δ]ι̣δάcκαλ[ο]ν, ὄνομα ᾽Απολλώνιον, οἱ δὲ Κλέωνά τινα, ἰαμβίζει ὡc τοὺc ἰδίουc μαθητὰc καταιcχύνοντα, ἐν ἤθει εὐνοίαc ἀπαγ[ο]ρεύων τοῦτο δρᾶν, μὴ ἁλῷ.

23–24 Reading τοῦτο rather than τούτῳ given by Pfeiffer (τουτω, papyrus) following the suggestion of W. Bühler (1964) 241, n. 4. D'Alessio in his edition (p. 614, n. 91) also refers to the notation of E. Fraenkel's own edition of Pfeiffer now in the Ashmolean Museum.

they send [ ]μη̣[.]ο̣νεινεπ̣α̣ς̣[.]ν̣α̣[ ]
alas these things [ ]ς̣·
at any rate . . [ ] . αιχα . . . μ . ς̣εων
. . . ευφ[ ]
. . . . [ ]. πολ. . [.]c. . [ ]
ψήφ. . . [. . .]ί. . [ ]. [
. . ε. . [.]ς̣η. . . . . [ ]. α[
ἔκφᾳ. [. . . .
ηcη̣τ̣ο̣. . [
ηδεcμ. [
and a muzzle[
ωγηcε. . [

"O Friend—for advice is something sacred—"
He attacks a schoolteacher, by name Apollonius,
but some say a certain Cleon, in iambic fashion
because he does vile things to his own students,
in the guise of good intention, urging him
not to do this, lest he be caught.

Ethical Criticism in Archaic Iambic

For an assessment of Callimachus' figuring of blame in these two poems, it will help to consider some archaic examples of the character of *psogos* poetry.

The dual nature of iambic blame poetry has a precursor in the treatment of Thersites in the second book of the *Iliad* (lines 211–77). Thersites is an inherently ridiculous figure. The physical description of Thersites stands in stark opposition to that expected of an epic hero,[3] and, as a foil for Achilles, Thersites inspires derision where the other inspires fear and anxiety. Yet much of what he utters is true, and his censure of Agamemnon, despite coming from a nonentity rather than a hero and being scorned by his audience, is nonetheless an effective description of the extremes of Agamemnon's actions. There is a place in this scene for both seriousness and laughter.

Seriousness and laughter appear in confluence in the ethical fragments of Archilochus. Archilochus' description of his preference for steadfastness over bravura in military leaders combines serious ethical statement with humorous overtones (fr. 114 W.):

> οὐ φιλέω μέγαν στρατηγὸν οὐδὲ διαπεπλιγμένον
> οὐδὲ βοστρύχοισι γαῦρον οὐδ' ὑπεξυρημένον,
> ἀλλά μοι σμικρός τις εἴη καὶ περὶ κνήμας ἰδεῖν
> ῥοικός, ἀσφαλέως βεβηκὼς ποσσί, καρδίης πλέως.
>
> I don't like my general tall nor with long, straddling legs,
> nor exulting in his curls nor part-shaven,
> rather let mine be short, and even knock-kneed about the legs to see,
> but standing firmly on his feet, and full of spirit.

As a medium of invective, archaic iambic often denounces its object in a direct, very personal manner for unethical behavior. Frequently the speaker perceives himself as the victim, or potential victim, of this behavior. The poetic utterance is then reactive, the mockery, threats, or derision by the speaker taking on a highly personal coloring. The fragments of archaic iambic concerned with betrayal and sexual conduct are of particular interest for Callimachus' *Iambi* 3 and 5. These I dis-

3. See ps.-Plutarch *De musica* on Thersites, discussion in Nagy (1979) 253–64. On seriousness and laughter in Homer see also B. Seidensticker, *Palintonos Harmonia: Studien zu komischen Elementen in der griechischen Tragödie* (Göttingen, 1982), 46–64.

cuss later in my treatment of the erotic aspects of these two poems. On the theme of personal betrayal, two examples, one of Archilochus and one of contested attribution (the so-called Strasbourg epode, *P. Argent.* 3-fr. *115 W. (194 dub. Deg.), cited below), help to demonstrate some of the characteristics of personal invective that recur in the archaic iambic tradition.

Archilochus fr. 172 W. is from the opening of an epodic poem in which the poet narrates the fable of the eagle and the fox as a paradigm of oath breaking. Lycambes' failure to abide by his oath is to lead, according to the speaker, to his becoming an object of popular scorn:

πάτερ Λυκάμβα, ποῖον ἐφράσω τόδε;
τίς σὰς παρήειρε φρένας
ἧις τὸ πρὶν ἠρήρησθα; νῦν δὲ δὴ πολὺς
ἀστοῖσι φαίνεαι γέλως.

Father Lycambes, what sort of thing is this you've conceived?
Who has led your wits astray
with which you were earlier fitted out? But now you will certainly
appear a subject of much laughter to your townsmen.

The poet in the role of advisor to an errant addressee, who may have abused the poet somehow, is a traditional figure that appears in many types of Greek verse, Hesiod to his brother Perses, Alcaeus to Pittacus, and much of Theognis. Advice here goes hand in hand with chastisement. The censuring poetic voice takes on the persona of the well-intentioned counselor; ψόγος is represented as εὔνοια [good intention].[4] The triadic structure of much archaic iambic (of speaker, addressee, and assumed audience of coevals) is a particularly apt setting for this role of the poetic voice. The one censured is excluded from the circle of the ἑταιρεία [fellowship] however this is constructed, and the reasons for his exclusion, and conditions of his reinclusion, are voiced by the poet as censure / advice.

Another version of this triadic structure is outright condemnation, curse, or denunciation, where the censured is not advised but banished forever from the possibility of reassimilation into the community of the poet and his companions. Such is frequently the fate

4. Especially noteworthy in this regard is the language of the Diegesis to *Iambus* 5: ἰαμβίζει ὡς | τοὺς ἰδίους μαθητὰς καταισχύνον | τα, ἐν ἤθει εὐνοίας ἀπαγ[ο]ρεύων τοῦ | το δρᾶν, μὴ ἁλῷ [he attacks [him] in iambic fashion because he does vile things to his own students, in the guise of good intention, urging him not to do this, lest he be caught].

of him who has betrayed the poet, broken his oath, or otherwise proven inconstant. Of many examples from archaic iambic the Strasbourg epode, generally now attributed to Hipponax,[5] is especially striking.

κύμ[ατι] πλα[ζόμ]ενος·
κἀν Σαλμυδ[ησσ]ῷ̣ι γυμνὸν εὐφρονε̣ . [
Θρήϊκες ἀκρό[κ]ομοι
λάβοιεν—ἔνθα πόλλ' ἀναπλήσαι κακὰ
δούλιον ἄρτον ἔδων—
ῥίγει πεπηγότ' αὐτόν· ἐκ δὲ τοῦ χνόου
φυκία πόλλ' ἐπέ̣χοι,
κροτέοι δ' ὀδόντας, ὡς [κ]ύ̣ων ἐπὶ στόμα
κείμενος ἀκρασίηι
ἄκρον παρὰ ῥηγμῖνα κυμα. . . . δ̣ο̣υ̣·
ταῦτ' ἐθέλοιμ' ἂ̣ν ἰδεῖν,
ὅς μ' ἠδίκησε, λ̣[ὰ]ξ δ' ἐ̣π' ὁρκίοις ἔβη,
τὸ πρὶν ἑταῖρος [ἐ]ών.
P. Argent. 3 fr. 1.4–16

beaten by a wave.
And at Salmydessus may the topknotted Thracians
[ ] welcome him naked
—there, eating the bread of slavery,
to fill up the measure of many evils—
frozen with cold; and may he have much seaweed
from the sea's foam
and may his teeth chatter, and as a dog lying on his face
in helplessness
by the very edge of the wave . . . . δ̣ο̣υ̣·
these things I would wish to see
of him, who wronged me, and who trampled on his oaths,
though he was a friend in the past.

The Hellenistic poets who revive iambic poetry have before them a particular tradition of earlier iambic as a medium of social interaction. Iambic poetry censures, mocks, and even exorcises, in language and imagery that may at once have elements of the serious and the unserious. Two qualities remain throughout the tradition of this poetry, from Archilochus and Hipponax to their Hellenistic emulators, (1) the ethical, the capability to define boundaries of ethical conduct, and (2) the personal, a poetic voice depicted as closely and personally involved in the act of censure or mockery.

5. See Degani to Hipponax fr. 194.

Iambus 3

INTRODUCTION

Callimachus' *Iambus* 3 is one of the shorter poems of the collection as we have it. Of some 39 lines, only the opening line and the final fifteen lines are more fully preserved. Of lines 2–23 only the right side of the column (in some cases the last choliamb and a half, in others less) is extant. According to the Diegesis, the poem consists of a lament on the corrupting nature of wealth, and a specific lament for an erotic failure, itself due to the corrupting nature of wealth. The poet has loved a young man named Euthydemus, who has, however, chosen to favor the attentions of a rich man, apparently through the arrangement of his own mother. This last detail the diegete found sufficiently striking to include in his summary. The diegete suggests something of this twofold division of the poem (especially the phrase παρεπι | κόπτει δὲ καὶ) into an opening general lament on the ethical character of the times, and then a personal invective address to one figure, Euthydemus. The conduct of the individual erotic figure (τῇ ὥρᾳ[6]) for lucre (πορισμῷ) in regard to a rich man (πλουσίῳ) is the specific example of the age of wealth (πλούτου) rather than virtue. The diegete does not reveal the personal quality of the appeal in either the general or the specific complaint, an omission that in itself is not especially surprising, as the diegete tends to limit himself to practical narrative. In the second part of the poem (lines 24–39) the poet first narrates an encounter with Euthydemus and a promise given by the latter, then broken. The poet, after uttering a vain wish that his fate had been other than to fall in love with such a character, that he had best served the cult of Cybele (line 35 Ķ[υβή]βῃ) or Adonis, concludes with a polytonal and consciously ambivalent statement of resignation to his Muses.

In his 1946 study of this poem, C. Dawson attempted a large-scale reconstruction of the earlier lines of the poem.[7] This reconstruction, while suggestive, now seems overbold, and postulates a great deal from the extant text.[8] However, to omit these fragmentary lines of the poem

6. Cf. Callim. fr. 226 and its Diegesis (Dieg. X 1–2). Πρὸς τοὺς | ὡραίους φησίν. Cf. Tib. 1.9.17, *auro ne pollue formam.*

7. "An Alexandrian Prototype of Marathus?" *AJP* 67 (1946): 1–15, in part repeated in his commentary on the *Iambi* (1950) 33–39.

8. In particular Dawson's reconstruction of the earlier part of the poem as a lament for the discovery of metals has no support in the extant text and involves an over-reading of the Diegesis to these lines. The severed lock of hair in fr. 110 Pf. *(The Lock of Berenice)* does utter a serio-comic lament for the discovery of iron (47–50). While there are a num-

altogether, as do some translations and studies, loses a sense of the structure and development of the poem. As is true with other poems in the collection, a careful reading of even very fragmentary lines can deliver a great deal of value for the interpretation of the whole poem.

A few observations on this first section of the poem. The opening line of *Iambus* 3, like those of the previous two poems, constitutes an evocation of a past age. In those poems, as in *Iambus* 3, the past era, or lost age, is a foil for the present one. In *Iambus* 1 the harmony of the Seven Sages of the mythical past contrasts with the querulous Alexandrian philologues of the present. In *Iambus* 2 the animal fable, evoking another age, contrasts with the varying voices of Callimachus' contemporaries. Here in *Iambus* 3 the earlier era contrasts with the present one of αἰσχροκέρδεια [acquisitiveness] a standard theme of Hellenistic iambic poetry, of which the narrator portrays himself as having been a victim.

A comparison of the opening lines of the *Iambi* reveals some of the same variations in theme and tone that characterize the poems as a collection. Several are direct addresses to divine figures or representations of divine figures (*Iambi* 3, 9, 12, 13), and several others contain references to such figures or representations (*Iambi* 6, 7, 10). A number of the remaining poems open as well with direct address of an intended audience (*Iambi* 1, 4, 5, 9), evoking the genre's occasionality.[9] The personal tone is characteristic of the genre, and opening direct address to divine figures is found in the surviving fragments of archaic iambic. But despite the nature of the genre and its characteristic style, the prominence of the divine in the opening lines of Callimachus' *Iambi* is nonetheless remarkable. Further, there is in the case of *Iambi* 3 and 13 a close association of poetic voice and the divine. In the latter poem the poetic voice achieves this association through the evocation of the ritual (even if figurative) act of libation. In *Iambus* 3.1 Εἰ ̆ ⌋θ' ἦν, ἄναξ⌊ ὤπολλον, ἡνίκ' οὐκ ἦα [O, would, Lord Apollo, I were, when I was not], the place of the address to Apollo in the center of the line, surrounded by the two poetic self-references, achieves the same effect.

The opening line of *Iambus* 3 evokes the following: close identification of poet and divine patron, longing for a past era, and, by con-

---

ber of similarities between the two poems (the unrealizable wish, the interior narrative, the pathetic tone), nothing in *Iambus* 3 suggests a lament for the discovery of metals. The insidious effects of gold upon men, and the deterioration of even precious metal with time, are central themes of Apollo's speech in *Iambus* 12.

9. See Depew (1992) 313–23.

trast, a plaintive tone of the speaker in his present circumstances. These are themes characteristic of the collection as a whole, and specifically of this poem which delineates the rejection of the poet by a different kind of critic, by an object of his attraction.

The first part of the poem shows a continuation of the rapport of poet and god, and this helps in more clearly assessing something of the structure of the whole composition. The poet addresses Apollo in the vocative and the second person singular (1 ἄ̣ι̣ναξ̣ ̣ ̣

as a mark of ethical downfall; here the line is emblematic of the transition of ages from one admired to one corrupted. Line 10 ληκῆcαι may serve as the aorist active infinitive either of ληκέω [to crackle] or ληκάω [to screw around]. Pfeiffer is undecided ("quid λ. in Call. significet non constat"), Dawson argues strongly for ληκάω, and D'Alessio also favors this option.[12] ληκάω, like τρώγειν (15), would introduce a vividly low element into the poem.

The fragmentary nature of the text contributes some degree of ambiguity to the referent at 11 οὐντραφεὶς δ' ὑμῖν [the one brought up among you]. Dawson[13] thought that 11–12 referred to one of the people Callimachus decries in the poem, and believed this to be a reference either to Euthydemus or to the rich man to whom Euthydemus is presented. "Next appeared the victims of Callimachus' invective: ἐκεῖνος ὥνθρωπος must be either the misguided Euthydemus or the rich man fortunate enough to secure his services."[14] I am less sure that this is the case. Assuming that οὐντραφεὶc δ' ὑμῖν line 11 and ἐκεῖνοc ὥνθρωποc line 12 are in apposition (they need not be), there is a notable parallel for the poetic voice referring to himself abstractly in the third person at *Aet.* fr. 1.35–38. Further this reference occurs here in the plural, immediately following a self-reference in the first person singular:

αὖθι τȷὸ δ' ιἐκȷδύοιμιȷ, τό μοι βάροc ὅccον ἔπεcτι
τριγȷλῴιχιȷν ὀλιοῷȷ νῆcοc ἐπ' Ἐγκελάδῳ.
. . . . . Μοῦcαι γȷὰρ ὅcουc ἴδον ὄθμαιτȷι παῖδαc
μὴ λοξῷ, πολιοὺcȷ οὐκ ἀπέθεντο φίλουc.

which (old age) in turn may I shed, which is a weight upon me
as is the three-cornered island upon deadly Enceladus.
. . . . . For whomever the Muses look upon as children
not with eye askance, these their friends they do not set aside
when grey.

This passage from fr. 1 also has something of the same nurturing/paideutic character with which Callimachus characterizes his relationship with divine inspiration elsewhere. It is less clear why this image would necessarily be applied to Euthydemus. If the image οὐντραφεὶc δ' ὑμῖν is taken as a paideutic one, which is given some support by line 30 κρηγύωc ἐπαιδεύθην, it is more likely to be self-referential, as is the image at line 30; the self-referential character of the whole poem is worth keeping in mind. Callimachus is playing in this erotic com-

12. D'Alessio (1996) 597, n. 53.
13. Dawson (1946) 5 and (1950) 35.
14. Dawson (1950) 38.

position with the language and imagery of homoerotic *paideia,* an arena familiar to the socio-cultural world of Callimachus and his audience.[15]

It is the personalization of this theme, its application to the speaker's own erotic experience, that is striking in *Iambus* 3. Resignation to a calling that brings with it poverty,[16] rejection by a beloved because of poverty, the choliambic singer characterized in part by poverty—the significance of poverty is a layered one.

The other arresting feature of the poem is the delineation of the poet's love and despair. In the second part of the poem (24–39) the poet, the *erastes,* is shown as victim of the boy Euthydemus and as victim of his own desire.[17] This last is a conceit of much homoerotic love poetry, especially epigram. This particular poetic voice of a rejected *erastes* moves a step further in this regard, effecting, in his own wish to be either a priest of Cybele (and hence a eunuch) or a lamenter of Adonis (and hence a woman), a deconstruction of his own masculine gender. Here in choliambic verses which invoke a plethora of images from a variety of poetic and non-poetic genres, Callimachus configures a persona of the suffering poet-*erastes,* a creation that itself calls attention both to its appropriation and to its novel construction of tradition.

In the pages that follow I focus on this particular manifestation of Callimachus' poetic persona, that of the impoverished poet-*erastes.* My discussion centers primarily on two aspects of this self-representation, (1) the poet's evocation of his own poverty, and (2) the language and imagery through which the poet characterizes homoerotic experience. Throughout, I argue that Callimachus blends in this work, as elsewhere in the *Iambi,* themes that are traditional in invective iambic verse with new focal points of his own period and of his own poetic self-imaging.

POVERTY AND THE POET

In approaching the ethical poems of Callimachus, it is helpful to recall how this poet configures censure. Callimachus in his programmatic poetry, or what we might loosely term poetry of intent, frequently uses censure as a means of self-definition. The poet's censure of others, or what he portrays as their censure of the poet, evolves into a close de-

15. Cf. W. Fitzgerald on Catullus and use of the language of aristocratic obligation in his erotic verse in *Catullan Provocations: Lyric Poetry and the Drama of Position* (Berkeley, 1995), 117–20.

16. On the multivalent sense of line 39 ἔνευσα [I have inclined] see my discussion below.

17. In this regard Callimachus prefigures especially Catullus.

lineation not of the censured or censorious other, but of the poetic voice. The *Aetia* prologue (fr. 1 Pf.) is less a characterization of other poets or another poetry than a declaration of the poet's own relationship to his composition. Similarly the delineated critic of *Iambus* 13 provides a mechanism through which the poet defines himself and his work in relation to earlier iambic verse. *Iambus* 13 is a definition of the poet's relationship, not the critic's, to this earlier tradition. In this construction of censure the poet's close relationship to the divine as a source of valorization of his composition is a crucial one. The relation of the poet and the divine is continually underscored as an ethical, and also aesthetic, bond—a bond from which the critic is excluded.

Iambus 3 is emblematic of the same construction of censure. The poem opens with an evocation of the poet's patron deity, Apollo, and closes with a portrayal of the poet's own choice of, or resignation to, the Muses, i.e. his own composition. In the course of the verses between these two markers of self-definition the poetic speaker relates and censures the rejection of his calling by his venal contemporary era, and the rejection of his erotic interest by the venal Euthydemus. The entire composition, while delineating a general and a specific portrayal of venality, is at the same time a self-portrayal of the poet and his calling contrapoised to this venality. Callimachus underscores this self-portrayal throughout the poem with repeated direct addresses and self-references, and with a final heightened emphasis in the lines of personal lament and resignation at the end.

We can ascertain from about the opening twenty lines of the poem that the poet lays forth a twofold antithesis: one of an earlier era and the present one, and one of himself and other men, or another man. The opening, very fragmentary section of the poem is an extended direct address to Apollo; the poet wishes to have lived in another era, one of other (and as we come to understand better) values. The movement of the poem evolves from a longing for an earlier era, with, for example ζόη μετέϲτραπται line 9 as a turning point, into a denunciation of the present one, to a lament for the poet's own poverty (17 με· φεῦ· τὸν ἄκληρο̣[ν). The self-characterization of the poet as poor, his art devalued by a materialistic age, is seemingly a trope of Hellenistic and Roman poetry, and to come upon such a self-characterization in Callimachus' *Iambi* is initially seemingly unremarkable. Yet I would suggest that in *Iambus* 3 Callimachus constructs a self-portrayal of the poet as poor and rejected that evolves from three quite varying impulses. The first is the social marginalization of the archaic singer of invective. The second is the conceptualization of the poet's art as the fruit of a relationship of poet and patron, a conceptualization developed in the

work of Pindar and Simonides and inherited by their Hellenistic emulators, with some new significance for a new and different period. The third is the self-imaging of the *erastes* in Callimachus' own homoerotic verse. As a theme, the poverty of the poet is at one and the same time two-directional. It is a theme that looks back to the traditions of earlier iambic poetry and the self-delineations of earlier iambic poets. And it looks to the contemporary Alexandrian setting, where it forms part of a new construction of the poetic persona and his place in society. At the same time, the rejected *erastes,* spurned for his empty hands, is a signature of Callimachean erotic.

Let us begin with earlier iambic, which Callimachus has constantly before him. The poverty of the poet and his surroundings figure largely throughout the fragments of Hipponax. Social marginalization in many aspects is at the center of Hipponax' composition as a whole. The physicality of poverty, cold, hunger, and lack are emblematic of a world outside of the *hetaireia* and its imagery of inclusion. The fragments in which the poet addresses his own poverty are especially pertinent here, both for the similarities and the differences they show to *Iambus* 3.

Ἑρμῆ, φίλ' Ἑρμῆ, Μαιαδεῦ, Κυλλήνιε,
ἐπεύχομαί τοι, κάρτα γὰρ κακῶς ῥιγῶ
καὶ βαμβαλύζω . . .
δὸς χλαῖναν Ἱππώνακτι καὶ κυπασσίσκον
καὶ σαμβαλίσκα κἀσκερίσκα καὶ χρυσοῦ
στατῆρας ἑξήκοντα τοὐτέρου τοίχου.
Hippon. fr. 32 W., 42 a + b Deg.

Hermes, dear Hermes, son of Maia, Cyllenian one,
I pray to you, for truly I am shivering terribly
and my teeth chatter . . .
give Hipponax a cloak and a little tunic
and little sandles and little boots and sixty gold staters
from the other side.

ἐμοὶ γὰρ οὐκ ἔδωκας οὔτέ κω χλαῖναν
δασεῖαν ἐν χειμῶνι φάρμακον ῥίγεος,
οὔτ' ἀσκέρηισι τοὺς πόδας δασείηισι
ἔκρυψας, ὥς μοι μὴ χίμετλα ῥήγνυται.
Hippon. fr. 34 W., 43 Deg.

For you did not at all give me a woolly cloak
remedy against shivering in winter,
nor did you cover my feet with little woolly
boots, that my chilblains not break open.

ἐμοὶ δὲ Πλοῦτος—ἔστι γὰρ λίην τυφλός—
ἐς τὠικί' ἐλθὼν οὐδάμ' εἶπεν "Ἱππῶναξ,

δίδωμί τοι μνέας ἀργύρου τριήκοντα
καὶ πόλλ' ἔτ' ἄλλα"· δείλαιος γὰρ τὰς φρένας.
Hippon. fr. 36 W., 44 Deg.

For me Wealth never—for he is very blind—
came to my house and said, "Hipponax
I give you thirty minae of silver
and many other things"; for he's a scrooge at heart.

A reading of these lines of Hipponax encounters a crucial feature that serves as a useful foil for an interpretation of Callimachus' *Iambus* 3, and one that should not be undervalued. Hipponax characterizes himself as poor and socially marginalized, but not because of his calling, not because of his being a poet per se. Rather, the evocation of poverty and social marginalization is a fixed component of archaic iambic; we see this also in the surviving poetry of Archilochus. However, the archaic iambic poet does not perceive himself as poor or socially marginalized because of his calling.

The Hellenistic iambic poet, in the evocation of his own poverty, looks in part to this generic direction. The poverty of the poet is characteristic of his low social status and is integral to the genre in which he composes. In Callimachus, however, this theme has other dimensions. On one level this self-imaging of the poet as poor is a characteristic feature of Callimachus' erotic voice. On a second level it is informed by another theme prevalent in Hellenistic poetry, namely the poet's need for regard and financial support, and his position in a world which is perceived as no longer guaranteeing these rewards to poets.

The poets of the early Hellenistic period found themselves in a new socio-cultural setting with new demands on creative artists. This was a different setting than that of the composers of choral lyric of the sixth and fifth centuries, who serve in many respects as models for poet-patron relations for these Hellenistic artists. The frequent evocation of these earlier figures in Hellenistic poetry and the paradigm, expressed explicitly or subtly, of this earlier patronage relationship, outline the changed conceptualization of the poet-patron dependency in the early third century, even if some of the details remain unclear. At the center of this changed configuration of poet and patron is the poet's relationship to the court and the Hellenistic ruler.[18]

The characterization of the poet's position as a dependent and his performance as one that is rewarded is already present in the De-

18. Two recent studies on this relationship are G. Weber, *Dichtung und höfische Gesellschaft: die Rezeption von Zeitgeschichte am Hof der ersten drei Ptolemäer* (Wiesbaden, 1993), 55–130, and Stephens (2003).

modocus episode in the *Odyssey*. The presence of lyric poets at the courts of the archaic tyrants is already indicative of an earlier model of court patronage. It is, however, with the choral poets of the sixth and fifth centuries that we observe a developing conceptualization of poetic composition as one of an economic exchange—poetic celebration for financial remuneration.[19] Pindar's demarcation at the beginning of his second Isthmian ode[20] of a new age of poetry for hire contrasted with an earlier age of poetry composed for love is in and of itself emblematic of this. In particular with the figure of the poet Simonides this conceptualization becomes, quite early in the tradition surrounding him,[21] a central feature. For the Hellenistic poets Simonides serves as both a positive and a negative paradigm: on the one hand they may choose to emulate his celebration of the κλέος [renown] of men, on the other to reject his storied φιλαργυρία [avarice][22] and αἰσχροκέρδεια [acquisitiveness].[23]

19. See Gentili (1988) 115–54; a recent treatment of this topic is L. V. Kurke, *The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy* (Ithaca, 1991).

20.

ἀ Μοῖσα γὰρ οὐ φιλοκερδής
πω τότ' ἦν οὐδ' ἐργάτις·
οὐδ' ἐπέρναντο γλυκεῖ-
αι μελιφθόγγου ποτὶ Τερψιχόρας
ἀργυρωθεῖσαι πρόσωπα μαλθακόφωνοι ἀοιδαί.
νῦν δ' ἐφίητι ⟨τὸ⟩ τὠργείου φυλάξαι
ῥῆμ' ἀλαθείας ⟨--⟩ ἄγχιστα βαῖνον,
'χρήματα χρήματ' ἀνήρ'
ὃς φῶ κτεάνων θ' ἅμα λειφθεὶς καὶ φίλων.

Pindar, *Isthmian* 2.6–11, tr. F. J. Nisetich, *Pindar's Victory Odes* (Baltimore, 1980), 300.

For the Muse was not in love with money then—
she didn't work for hire,
nor would wanton songs
with silvered faces saunter
from melodious Terpsichora's shop
into the marketplace.
But now she'd have us.
Install the Argive's maxim,
words that very
nearly hit the truth:

Money, money is the man! he said
when he lost his friends,
together with his wealth.

21. On this tradition see Gentili (1988), 151–54, 161–62, R. Hunter, *Theocritus and the Archaeology of Greek Poetry* (Cambridge, 1996), 98.

22. See Schol. Pind. *Isth.* 2.9b (III 214 Drachm.).

23. See Xenoph. fr. 21 Gent.-Pr.; Athen. 14.656d = *Chamael.* fr. 33 Wehrli.

The surviving poem of the early Hellenistic period that treats this theme in the greatest detail is Theocritus *Idyll* 16, *The Graces or Hiero,*[24] a poem that shares a number of remarkable similarities with Callimachus' *Iambus* 3. Among these are the evocation of a nobler (and more generous) age, the present social marginalization of the singer, and a final statement of resignation (also in markedly innovative terms) to the poet's calling. In particular the first series of rhetorical questions posed by the poetic voice on behalf of his rejected compositions (lines 5–15) left unrewarded and cold is a valuable parallel for our text.

Τίς γὰρ τῶν ὀπόσοι γλαυκὰν ναίουσιν ὑπ' ἠῶ
ἡμετέρας Χάριτας πετάσας ὑποδέξεται οἴκῳ
ἀσπασίως, οὐδ' αὖθις ἀδωρήτους ἀποπέμψει;
αἳ δὲ σκυζόμεναι γυμνοῖς ποσὶν οἴκαδ' ἴασι,
πολλά με τωθάζοισαι ὅτ' ἀλιθίην ὁδὸν ἦλθον,
ὀκνηραὶ δὲ πάλιν κενεᾶς ἐν πυθμένι χηλοῦ
ψυχροῖς ἐν γονάτεσσι κάρη μίμνοντι βαλοῖσαι,
ἔνθ' αἰεὶ σφίσιν ἕδρη, ἐπὴν ἄπρακτοι ἵκωνται.
τίς τῶν νῦν τοιόσδε; τίς εὖ εἰπόντα φιλήσει;
οὐκ οἶδ'· οὐ γὰρ ἔτ' ἄνδρες ἐπ' ἔργμασιν ὡς πάρος ἐσθλοῖς
αἰνεῖσθαι σπεύδοντι, νενίκηνται δ' ὑπὸ κερδέων.

For who of those who dwell below the silvery dawn
will gladly open their doors and receive our Graces
in their home, and not send them away without a gift?
For they with dark brow and naked feet come home,
and deride me greatly because their journey was fruitless,
then cowering they remain again, at the bottom of an empty chest,
casting their heads on their cold knees,
where they always have their place when they return unsuccessful.
Who of those today is such a man? Who will love one who speaks well?
I know of none. For no longer as before are men eager
to be praised for their noble deeds, but they are overcome by profits.

The conceptualization of poetic composition in these lines is both as part of an economic exchange (cf. line 7 ἀδωρήτους), as well as an exchange on a more elevated or idealized level (cf. lines 13–14 φιλήσει). Theocritus here recasts Pindaric and Simonidean language and imagery to his own socio-cultural surroundings, and does this in a poem that is a recasting of earlier epinician poet-patron relations.[25] At the same time there is the typically Hellenistic awareness of the physicality of the text. The return of the papyrus rolls to their cold chest is sym-

24. Treated with great sensitivity by Hunter (1996) 77–109.

25. On the recollections of Pindar and Hieron I see Gow's commentary to this poem passim, F. T. Griffiths, *Theocritus at Court* (Leiden, 1979), 9–50 passim, Hunter (1996) 82–90.

bolic of the poet's own unsuccessful quest for patronage, and will later in the poem be reversed in the poetic speaker's own disinclination to leave his home in vain (lines 104–9).[26]

In several fragments Callimachus explicitly rejects the evaluation of poetic composition in monetary terms. In one instance Simonides is put forth as a foil by name. Pfeiffer assigns fr. 222 (a fragment in iambic trimeter cited in the scholia to Pind. *I.* 2.9) to the *Iambi:*

οὐ γὰρ ἐργάτιν τρέφω
τὴν Μοῦcαν, ὡc ὁ Κεῖοc Ὑλίχου νέπουc

for I do not nourish
a Muse for hire, as did the Kean son of Hylichus

The Pindaric image of poetry for hire as prostitution (cf. *I.* 2.6–8) is a particularly vivid one, as is the poet's rejection in this case of the role of πορνοβοσκός [pimp]. The association with Simonides and poetic composition for financial gain is made very clearly.[27] The passage evokes an image of the poet fostering the Muse which Callimachus uses elsewhere,[28] and indeed a rejection of "promiscuous verse" that Calli-

26.

ὦ Ἐτεόκλειοι Χάριτες θεαί, ὦ Μινύειον
Ὀρχομενὸν φιλέοισαι ἀπεχθόμενόν ποτε Θήβαις,
ἄκλητος μὲν ἔγωγε μένοιμί κεν, ἐς δὲ καλεύντων
θαρσήσας Μοίσαισι σὺν ἀμετέραισιν ἴοιμ' ἄν.
καλλείψω δ' οὐδ' ὔμμε· τί γὰρ Χαρίτων ἀγαπατόν
ἀνθρώποις ἀπάνευθεν; ἀεὶ Χαρίτεσσιν ἅμ' εἴην.

O goddesses, Eteocleian Graces, who love
Minyan Orchomenos once hated by Thebes,
uninvited I would remain at home, but to the homes
of those who invite me I would go,
taking courage, with my Muses.
You I will not leave aside. For what joy is there for men
apart from the Graces? May I ever be together with them.

27. See Hunter (1996) 97–98. The identification, as Hunter notes, of Simonides with the commercial poets of the opening of Pindar's second Isthmian Ode may indeed originate with Callimachus. See further T. Fuhrer, *Die Auseinandersetzung mit den Chorlyrikern in den Epinikien des Kallimachos* (Basel/Kassel, 1992), 214, n. 806.

28. So apparently in the *Aetia* prologue (fr. 1 Pf., Pfeiffer's conjecture) lines 23–24:

. . . . .]. . . ἀοιδέ, τὸ μὲν θύοc ὅττι πάχιcτον
θρέψαι, τὴ]ν Μοῦcαν δ' ὠγαθὲ λεπταλέην·

. . . . .]. . . singer, raise your sacrificial victim
as fat as possible, but your Muse, good man, slender.

Here, however, θρέψαι appears to lack the erotic connotation of τρέφω in fr. 222, on which see Hunter (1996) 98, n. 61. Of particular interest is the parallel at *Iambus* 3.11 οὐντραφεὶc

machus also employs, famously, in *Ep.* 28 (2 G.-P.),[29] another poem concerned with promiscuous poetry and a promiscuous beloved. At the same time this fragment with its stark opposition of base gain and artistic talent, calls forth in a singular way, with the allusion to Simonides, a perceived conflict of artistic motivation.

This same conflict lies at the heart of the paradigm of *Iambus* 12, where Apollo, in the role of poet, praises the enduring qualities of song over the fading and perishable qualities of gold. Here song competes with playthings made of gold, the precious metal that not only fades but also is detrimental to humanity. Song surpasses the other gifts; it is the καλλίcτη δόcιc (68), and hence cannot be evaluated in terms of its ephemeral and detrimental competitor.

An especially tantalizing text I would add here is the recently published *SH* fr. 253, assigned conjecturally by several scholars to the end of the second book of the *Aetia.* Only one line is fully readable, as two later authors cite it, one of whom is Artemidorus[30] who confirms that the context is dreaming and poverty. Line 11 reads αἰεὶ τοῖc μικκοῖc μικκὰ διδιοῦcι θεοί [ever the gods give small things to small men]. A. Cameron has suggested[31] assigning this dream fragment with its dream (line 12 ὄνειρον) and Muses (line 13 Μουcέων) to the end of *Aetia* 2 to parallel the *Somnium* (fr. 2) which opens *Aetia* 1 (where the poet envisions himself as a young shepherd). If we further infer μικκά [small things] to be in one sense a stylistic metaphor for Callimachus' poetry, we have a poetic statement that, like *Iambus* 3, is self-reflective on the themes of the poet's poetry and poverty, portraying poetry and poverty in terms of a personal past narrative.

The Alexandrian iambic poet is poor because of his calling and the evaluation of this calling by others. Callimachus in *Iambus* 3 takes this theme one step further. A popular decline in the evaluation of poetry and the poetic calling results not only in the poet's material lack (e.g. line 17 ἄκληρο[ν), but in his erotic defeat. Ethical censure of a venal age evolves into ethical censure of a venal beloved, and marginalization of the poetic calling turns out to be marginalization of the erotic self. This marginalization of the erotic self is the focus of the following section of this study.

δ' ὑμῖν. The arresting quality of the juxtaposed images of prostitute (ἐργάτιc) and Muse in fr. 222 has something of a tonal parallel in the green fig eating Muses of *Iambus* 1.92–93.

29. Recent interpretations of this much debated poem are Koenen (1993) 84–89, Cameron (1995) 387–402, Gutzwiller (1998) 218–22. Cf. also P. Bing's translation in Bing and Cohen, *Games of Venus* (New York, 1991), 136.

30. *Onirocr.* 4.84.

31. Cameron (1995) 138–40.

The second part of the poem (24–39), the narrative of Euthydemus' rejection of the poet, is fortunately largely preserved.[32] This part of the poem is in turn in two sections: a reminiscent narrative of an encounter of the poet and his beloved (c. 24–30) and a final lament of the poet on his present state (c. 31–39). Each of these sections contains some remarkable images of social marginalization and gender figuration, ending in a self-resignation to a poetic calling that is at once a statement of program and defeat.

Callimachus' homoerotic poetics of personal suffering, behavioral criticisms, and distanced irony is informed by several traditions. Callimachus refashions these traditions to create a new and strikingly poignant erotic persona that manifests itself with equal yet different effect in several poetic genres. Among these traditions are the rage of the rejected singer of archaic iambic, the pathos and humor of the composer of erotic epigram, and a world of homoerotic paideutic imagery inherited from the socio-cultural arena of the archaic and classical polis. This last is a world reflected for Callimachus (and for us) in the elegiac collection known as the *Theognidea* and in the *Symposia* of Xenophon and especially Plato. Recent scholarship has brought greater emphasis to Callimachus' use of Plato[33] as well as to the representation and significance of the relationship of *erastes* and *eromenos* in several Hellenistic poets.[34] Less attention, however, has been given to Callimachus' manipulation of the language and imagery of this homoerotic paideutic relationship to develop his own self-portrayal, that of a rejected if (self-ironically) wiser lover. In this self-portrayal the education is not of the *eromenos,* but of the *erastes.*

The focus of this part of my analysis is a close reading of lines 24–39 of *Iambus* 3. These lines constitute an erotic narrative in which

32. The structure of the poem is divided into two parts, one characterized by the poet's direct address to Apollo, one by the narrative of the poet and Euthydemus referred to in the third person, is quite clear. It is more difficult to judge at what point the poem takes on an erotic overtone. ληκῆσαι (line 10) may be either the aorist infinitive of ληκέω [to crackle] or ληκάω [to screw around]: the poem could thus take on an erotic overtone already at this line. Neither verb is attested elsewhere in Callimachus nor in archaic iambic; the latter is not uncommon in Attic comedy. Dawson is confident that ληκάω is meant here as suiting the context. However, Callimachus' partiality to sound and a vivid language of sound make one hesitate to easily dismiss ληκέω. ἄκληρο̣[ν line 17 might refer both to the poet's poverty and hence to his unhappy erotic situation, for which this poverty is the cause.

33. See e.g. White (1994) 135–61.

34. Hunter (1996) 167–95

the poetic voice tells of an encounter with a venal youth, one Euthydemus, who rejects the poet's advances, and of the poet's ironic wish to be rid of his own erotic desires. The narrative comprises several voices even in a few lines: that of the poetic narrator in the present (26 ἔφηcα), that of the poet-*erastes* of the past recalled (26 χαῖρ') and that of the *eromenos* (28 εἶπεν), a narrative technique that recalls the use of multiple perspectives in earlier lyric, especially Sappho.[35] Critics have long been troubled by the language of the relationship portrayed here, some suggesting that a real contractual bond is depicted between the two men, others that the whole is entirely, self-mockingly fictitious. I will attempt to demonstrate here rather that Callimachus is in fact not only varying but actually inverting the traditional roles of *erastes* and *eromenos* of an earlier cultural tradition. In so doing he is deliberately and self-consciously appropriating to himself, the *erastes,* the experience of homoerotic *paideia.* And he does this in terms that his audience could not fail to recognize as at once suggestive of an earlier erotic setting and at the same time as evoking a contemporary and different one.

In the following pages I first briefly survey Callimachus' imaging of this homoerotic relationship elsewhere in his poetry to establish a few guidelines for interpreting *Iambus* 3. Then I turn to these lines of *Iambus* 3, and to several of the tantalizing if enigmatic images that these fragmentary lines provide. Finally in a comparison of this passage with two of his epigrams I further highlight Callimachus' choice of paideutic terminology and metaphor in developing the figure of the *erastes,* now the wiser for his misfortunes, into the voice of a *praeceptor amoris.* This last is a role in which Callimachus in many ways prefigures his emulators among the Roman elegists, for whom his erotic poetry is particularly significant.

Reflections of the language and imagery of homoerotic *paideia* and of the traditional settings of this relationship occur in much of Callimachus' work. These reflections are indicative, as are those of *Iambus* 3, of a conscious reference to and manipulation of archaic and classical traditions. In the third book of the *Aetia* Callimachus chronicles the love of Acontius and Cydippe (frr. 67–75 Pf.). The beauty of the boy Acontius is represented through the effects it has on others, specifically on the εἰcπνῆλαι [lovers] in the public arena of the gymnasium (frr.

35. J. Winkler, "Double Consciousness in Sappho's Lyrics," in *The Constraints of Desire* (New York, 1990), passim. On the voice of Sappho fr. 31 see Y. Prins, *Victorian Sappho* (Princeton, 1999), 28–40.

68 and 69).[36] The term εἰcπνῆλαι is a technical Spartan one Theocritus employs at *Idyll* 12.13. The diegete says the poet addressed *Iambus* 4 to a man he called a παιδοκλέπτηc [boy-snatcher], a term that led Pfeiffer to suggest that Callimachus may have had in mind here something like the Cretan homoerotic "kidnappings" detailed by Ephorus (*FGrH* 70 Fr. 149.21).[37] Here too, as in the case of εἰcπνῆλαι in fr. 68, the poet inserts a learned reference to an earlier homoerotic culture. Fr. 226 Pf. (now assigned by some scholars, including A. Cameron, to the *Iambi*) is addressed, according to the diegete, πρὸc τοὺc | ὡραίουc [to beautiful young men]. This poem told a version of the story of the Lemnian women, apparently with a didactic purpose (as is suggested by the Diegesis lines 4–5 διόπερ καὶ ὑμεῖc | εἰc τὸ μέλλον ἀποβλέπετε [wherefore do you also look to the future]). Certainly didactic is the speech of the ithyphallic statue of Hermes in *Iambus* 9. The statue, set in a small wrestling school, is asked by the passing *erastes* whether his priapic condition is due to the beauty of the handsome youth Philetades. The statue tells the origin of his condition, and warns that the *erastes* loves Philetades to bad purpose (ἐπὶ κακῷ δὲ αὐτὸν φιλεῖν). Here, as in *Iambus* 3, it is the *erastes* who is the object of instruction.

This brief overview of paiderastic passages in Callimachus foregrounds three features in particular. These are (1) the traditional public setting, (2) the feature of the didactic, and (3) the aspect of the ethical—that love may be to good or bad purpose. This last is one of the central tenets, we should remember, of the speech of Pausanias in Plato's *Symposium*.

Combining all three of these features in a startling manner is *Iambus* 5, which in some respects serves as a mirror image of *Iambus* 3. Both poems are concerned with the sexual behavior of another individual. In both poems the poetic voice is an ethically critical one, which represents itself in the tradition of invective as the ludic champion of

36.

μέμβλετο δ' εἰcπνήλαιc ὁππότε κοῦροc ἴοι
φωλεὸν ἠὲ λοετρόν

He was an object of care to the lovers whenever
he went to school or the bath

πολλοὶ καὶ φιλέοντεc Ἀκόντιον ἦκαν ἔραζε
οἰνοπόται Cικελὰc ἐκ κυλίκων λάταγαc

And many of those who loved Acontius cast to the ground
as they drank their wine Sicilian drops from their cups

37. See Pfeiffer in his commentary ad loc.

regularity. *Iambus* 5 is directed to a schoolteacher (γραμματοδιδάcκαλοc), and advises him to cease taking sexual advantage (καταιcχύνοντα) of his pupils. The positive paiderastic educational relationship delineated in Plato's *Symposium* is perverted here into a negative one. Further the chiding speaker evokes traditional poetic imagery of the erotic in the poem itself as negative paradigm, the ember is not to be allowed to burn stronger but should be quelled, the horses are not to be incited but restrained. The stance of the poetic "I" in regard to the sexual behavior in the two poems is, however, different. In *Iambus* 5 the "I" stands outside in the character of one giving warning and advice. The poet of *Iambus* 3, however, is directly involved in the behavior of Euthydemus. The poet is the victim of the young man's actions.

To turn to our passage, the poet's narrative of betrayal and resignation. The passage is lacunose and in a few places problematic:

. . . . .]c, ὥc[π]ερ Εὐθύδημον ἡ μήτηρ
. . . .]. ανα. νυν οὐδὲ πῦρ ἐναύουcιν
. . .]χαῖρ' ἔφηcα. [.]. ιν. λῷ [c]υναντήcαc
. .]δεξιὴν ἔδωκε κ. πα. . cπλάγχνα
. [. .]ν ἐν ἱραῖc εἶπεν [ἡμέ]ραιc ἥκειν
καὶ γαμβρὸν. . . ω. . . α[.]φίλον θέcθαι
. . υ[. .]. . χε. [.]ν κρηγύωc ἐπαιδεύθην
. . [ἐ]φρόνηcα τὠγαθὸν βλέψαι
]τε καὶ θεοὺc ἀπρηγεῦνταc
]. . μόχθηροc ἐξεκνήμωc. [
]. ν μοι τοῦτ' ἂν ἦν ὀνήϊc[το]ν
.]υ[.]. [.]Κ[υβή]βῃ τὴν κόμην ἀναρρίπτειν
Φρύγ[α] πρ[ὸc] αὐλὸν ἢ ποδῆρεc ἕλκοντα
Ἄδω[ν]ιν αἰαῖ, τῆc θεοῦ τὸν ἄνθρωπον,
ἰηλεμίζειν· νῦν δ' ὁ μάργοc ἐc Μούcαc
ἔνευcα· τοίγα[ρ] ἦν ἔμαξα δει[πν]ήcω.

. . . . .]c, just as his mother Euthydemus
. . . .]. ανα. νυν nor do they light fire
. . .] greetings I said . [.]. ιν. λῷ on meeting with him
. .] he gave his right hand κ. πα. . cπλάγχνα
. [. .]ν said he had come on the holy days
and his suitor . . . ω. . . α[.] friend to make
. . υ[. .]. . χε. [.]ν I was honorably brought up
. . [ ]it was my intention to look to the good
]τε and the gods doing nothing
]. . wretch destroyed. [
]. ν this would have been best for me
.]υ[.]. [.] to cast back my hair for Kybebe
to Phrygian flute or dragging [my robe] to my feet
to cry, alas Adonis, as follower of the goddess.

But now, a horny madman, I have inclined to the Muses.
Therefore that which I have kneaded I shall dine upon.

The narrative configures some sort of erotic interchange with the youth named Euthydemus: a greeting, a giving of a hand, a promise to come ἐν ἱραῖc . . . [ἡμέ]ραιc [on the holy days]. The poet recalls this interchange, framing his reminiscence with two delineations of marginalization, social and psychological. The longed-for past era of the poem's opening is recast in this personal recollection, effecting a parallel structure. Idealized past and venal present are replaced in the narrator's recollection with happier past and rejected present.

My reading of these lines centers on select points in this text that (1) highlight the poet's manipulation of a traditional homoerotic construct, *paiderasteia,* and (2) contribute to the fashioning of his own erotic persona. First, however, a few observations on the context of the poet's recollection, the figures and the setting.

The fragmentary lines 19–23 appear to have furthered the transition from general criticism of the age to specific lament. Line 24 ὥc̣[π]ερ Εὐθύδημον ἡ μήτηρ appears to begin the erotic narrative (assuming the comparative adverb ὥcπερ to be the correct reading), introducing this narrative as an instance of the larger ethical decline. Clayman[38] makes the attractive suggestion that the name Euthydemus is a fiction meant to evoke an association with Socrates. The poet's play throughout this part of the poem with aspects of Platonic homoerotic *paideia* may support this. Euthydemus, apparently the agent of the poet's reminiscence[39] (27 ἔδ̣ωκε, 28 εἶπεν), is the object of his mother's action at line 24. The extant lines of *Iambus* 3 reveal little of the figure of the boy's mother in the role of pander. The diegete, otherwise quite cryptic on the erotic episode, was sufficiently struck by this aspect of the poem to note it at the end of his summary (ὑ | πὸ τῆc μητρὸc πλουcίῳ cυcταθέντα). The figure of an old woman as pander is a not unfamiliar one in Hellenistic literature (e.g. Gyllis in Herod. 1, the mother of Philista and Melixo in Theocr. *Id.* 2; the type was said to be a specialty of Menander's). In the context of homoerotic love the role of the boy's mother can attain a particular authority.[40] The diegete's note and the poem's subsequent narrative may suggest something of a transgression of tra-

38. Clayman (1980) 21

39. The one who swears the oath at lines 27–28 could also be the boy's mother. Tib. 1.9.1–2 (and also 1.4.21–24) which appear to imitate this passage suggest rather that Euthydemus swears the oath.

40. Cf. Theocr. *Id.* 12.30–33. The mother of Polyphemus in Theocr. *Id.* 11 is also a parallel.

ditional gendered spaces as well. The mother is not usually found in the public male areas of interaction of *eromenos* and *erastes*.[41]

Some scholars have read line 25 οὐδὲ πῦρ ἐναύουcιν as denoting a denial of fire to the speaker. The denial of fire to an individual is a mark of ἀτιμία—the denial of civic / ritual necessity to one outcast. The perception of the poet is then of one not only poor but marginalized, put beyond the pale of ordinary civic intercourse with others.

Callimachus employs ἐναύονται twice in *Iambus* 13 in the sense of "to be inspired," and some have objected that his use of the verb here in *Iambus* 3 with a different meaning is less than felicitous (although he uses the verb with apparent literal sense again at *Hecale* fr. 74.28 Hollis). However, *Iambus* 3 is also a poem which has to do with poetic inspiration. Lines 38–39 νῦν δ' ὁ μάργοc ἐc Μούcαc | ἔνευcα [but now, a horny madman, I have inclined to the Muses] can be understood as something of a *double entendre*; a sense, if partly ironic, of inspiration is not entirely lacking here. The subject of ἐναύουcιν at line 25 is not entirely clear. Some interpreters have assumed this to be Euthydemus and his mother, but the accusative Εὐθύδημον in the previous line makes this a little uncomfortable. D'Alessio[42] makes the interesting suggestion that it is Euthydemus and his mother who are excluded and who are rather the objects of the verbal action.

Line 26 . . .]χαῖρ' ἔφηcα [. . . greetings I said] begins the poet's recollection of his meeting with Euthydemus. The poet is thus both narrator and a figure of his narrative. The boy then swears an oath to come to the poet; at line 31 ἐ]φρόνηcα the poetic narrator has returned from his reminiscence to the narrative frame and to his lament, which continues to the end of the poem.

One of Callimachus' poetic conceits in all of his erotic verse is to phrase his erotic persona in terms of knowledge. In her recent study of his erotic epigrams K. Gutzwiller has drawn attention to Callimachus' marked use of expressions of knowing (e.g. οἶδα, γιγνώσκω, ἐπίσταμαι) in representing the erotic condition, his own or others.[43] In our passage this same conceit is developed a step further. Prominent in this poem is the language and imagery of homoerotic *paideia*. There is further a marked inversion of this imagery, the object of the paideutic experience being the *erastes* rather than the *eromenos*. I would call attention in this regard to the following phrases: line 30 κρηγύωc

41. D'Alessio (1996) 595, n. 50 notes the parallel of Giton, corrupted by his mother at Petronius *Satyr.* 81.5 *qui ne vir esset a matre persuasus est.* The passage also plays consciously with transgression of gendered spaces.

42. D'Alessio (1996) 598, n. 54.

43. Gutzwiller (1998) 215–17.

ἐπαιδεύθην [I was honorably brought up], 31 ἐ]φρόνηcα τὠγαθὸν βλέψαι [it was my intention to look to the good], and also to 11 οὐντραφεὶς δ' ὑμῖν [the one raised among you], assuming this phrase refers to the speaker, as I believe we can from the dialogue structure of the first part of the poem.

Line 30 κρηγύωc ἐπαιδεύθην strikes a particular resonance of paideutic language. The phrase, as Pfeiffer notes, is paralleled in [Plato] *Alcib. I* 111e οὐκ ἐπίστανται οὐδὲ κρήγυοι διδάσκαλοί εἰσι τούτων [they do not know nor are they good teachers of these things]. The expression in Callimachus' poem is in part an inversion of the Platonic image.[44] The adverb κρηγύως does not occur elsewhere in Callimachus, nor does the adjective κρήγυος. Nor are these attested for Hipponax. However, the adjective does occur in the third line of Theocr. *Ep.* 13 G.-P. (19 Gow), an epigram in choliambic verse on the tomb of Hipponax.[45]

κρήγυος occurs only one other time in the poems of the bucolic corpus, [Theocritus] *Id.* 20.19 ποιμένες, εἴπατέ μοι τὸ κρήγυον· οὐ καλὸς ἐμμί; Here, however, apparently the meaning is that of ἀληθές [truth] "Shepherds, tell me the truth; am I not fair?"[46] κρήγυος occurs in two other Hellenistic choliambic poets, Herodas 4.46, 6.39,[47] and Phoenix fr. 6.4 (p. 235 Powell); see also Cercidas fr. 7.14 (p. 209 Powell) καΐ τι ματεύει κράγυον. Gow suggests in his commentary to *Ep.* 19 that κρήγυος may well have been a word used by Hipponax, and by his Hellenistic emulators as a Hipponactean signet.[48] This suggestion is particularly attractive given the moralistic cast Hipponax assumes in the Hellenistic period. There may be another Hipponactean correspondence in these lines of *Iambus* 3 in the rare verb ἐκκνημόω (33), which has an apparent parallel in the equally rare παρακνημόομαι of Hippon. fr. 95.9 W. (98 Deg.). The paideutic aspect of line 30 continues in the following line. H. Lloyd-Jones has observed that line 31]φρόνηcα, ἐ]φρόνηcα in Pfeiffer's text, could equally be ἐcωφρόνηcα (both are metrically sound). This suggestion is attractive for the connotation of sexual continence or moderation that this term can imply.

Tantalizing is line 29 γαμβρόν, which I have rendered as "suitor." γαμβρόc is, of course, a striking term in this context. In Sappho's *Epi-*

44. D'Alessio (1996) 599, n. 57 notes the parallel at Tib. 1.9.37 *at non ego fallere doctus.*

45. I cite this epigram with translation above in ch. 1, p. 36.

46. See Gow in his commentary on this epigram.

47. See Headlam's extensive note 298–99.

48. *Theocritus,* vol. 2, 543.

thalamia a γαμβρόc is a bridegroom,[49] so too in Theocritus' *Idylls* 15[50] and 18.[51] The noun γαμβρός occurs twice elsewhere in Callimachus in the sense rather of "son-in-law." In *Aetia* fr. 75.33[52] γαμβρόc is frequently translated as "bridegroom," but is better understood as "son-in-law" in juxtaposition with the πενθερόc of the previous line; lines 30–33 of this passage are an elaborate antithesis of Ceyx and Acontius. Further, Apollo (the speaker of these lines) uses the word νυμφίοc of Acontius as bridegroom in the lines immediately preceding,[53] rather than variant terms; the choice of two different terms reflects two different as-

49.

τίωι c', ὦ φίλε γάμβρε, κάλωc ἐικάcδω;
ὄρπακι βραδίνωι cε μάλιcτ' ἐικάcδω.

Sappho fr. 115 L.-P.

To what, fair bridegroom, shall I well liken you?
To a slender sapling shall I most liken you.

cf. also frr. 111.5, 112.1, 116, 117.

50. Theocr. *Id.* 15.129 ὀκτωκαιδεκετὴς ἢ ἐννεακαίδεχ' ὁ γαμβρός. [of eighteen or nineteen is the bridegroom.]

51. Theocr. *Id.* 18.9 Οὕτω δὴ πρωιζὰ κατέδραθες, ὦ φίλε γαμβρέ; [So early did you fall asleep, dear bridegroom?]

Gow suggests in his commentary to this line that the use of the word γαμβρός may be a recollection of this use in Sappho's *Epithalamia:* "The use of the word for bridegroom is regular in Sappho's epithalamia . . . and, if not already traditional, no doubt comes from her."

52.

ἀργύρῳ οὐ μόλιβον γὰρ Ἀκόντιον, ἀλλὰ φαεινῷ
ἤλεκτρον χρυcῷ φημί cε μειξέμεναι.
Κοδρείδηc cύ γ' ἄνωθεν ὁ πενθερός, αὐτὰρ ὁ Κεῖοc
γαμβρὸc Ἀριcταίου [Ζη]νὸc ἀφ' ἱερέων
Ἰκμίου οἶcι μέμ[η]λεν ἐπ' οὔρεοc ἀμβώνεccιν
πρηΰνειν χαλ[ε]πὴν Μαῖραν ἀνερχομένην,
αἰτεῖcθαι τὸ δ' ἄημα παραὶ Διὸc ᾧ τε θαμεινοί
πλήccονται λινέαιc ὄρτυγεc ἐν νεφέλαιc.'

Callim. fr. 75.30–37

For I say in Acontius you will not mix lead with silver,
but electrum with shining gold.
You, the father-in-law, trace your line back to Codrus,
but your Cean son-in-law to the priests of Zeus Aristaeus,
whose care it is upon the crests of the Icmian mountain
to soothe harsh Maira as she rises,
and to beg the breeze from Zeus by which
many partridges fill the linen nets."

53.

Δήλῳ δ' ἦν ἐπίδημοc, Ἀκόντιον ὁππότε cὴ παῖc
ὤμοcεν, οὐκ ἄλλον, νυμφίον ἐξέμεναι.

Callim. fr. 75.26–27

pects of the marital union. A fragment of the *Hecale* also preserves the word γαμβρόc,[54] here clearly as a son-in-law.

The term in the context of this passage of *Iambus* 3 is arresting, as all the personages involved in the poet's reminiscence here are male; the poetic narrator and Euthydemus and, if he is referred to in these lines, the rich man of the Diegesis are all men. Even when the poem's audience understands γαμβρόc to reflect a relationship of "son-in-law" to Euthydemus' mother, the term is an unusual one of a homosexual union. We appear to have here a specific image of marital union used not, as was once suggested, of a *de facto* marriage contract,[55] but rather transferred to the world of homoerotic love. This transference of marital imagery is striking for the characterization in itself, and also in light of the fluidity of gender imagery in the concluding lines of the poem.

Missing in this narrative is the fourth figure of the diegete's summary, the rich man who is the new recipient of Euthydemus' attentions. There is some ground for inferring that he does not figure in the narrator's erotic recollection itself (26–29). This begins at line 26 and appears to end at line 30 with a return to the narrator as first person speaker—the other speaker of the intervening reminiscence is apparently Euthydemus. This structure allows little room for the introduction of a third *dramatis persona*. Assuming that the diegete is referring to something that occurred in the poem and is not drawing an inference from it with the words ὐ | πὸ τῆc μητρὸc πλουcίῳ cυcταθέντα,[56] we need a place in the poem where this introduction would fit. The narrator alone appears to be the sole figure of lines 30–39; this can be assumed in part from the predominance of first person singular verbs: ἐπαιδεύθην, ἐ]φρόνηca or ἐcω]φρόνηca, μοι τοῦτ' ἂν ἦν ὀνήϊc[το]ν̣, ἕνευcα, δει̣[πν]ήcω. There is, of course, an ambiguity in the text as it stands with line 33] . . μόχθηροc ἐξεκνήμωc.[. The possiblility for *brevis in longo* in the final position of the line would allow for ἐξεκνήμωcα (the poetic narrator), ἐξεκνήμωcε (Euthydemus—so Dawson), or even conceivably ἐξεκνήμωcαc (addressed by the speaker to Euthydemus). Cal-

---

But she was resident in Delos, when your child swore
To have Acontius, and no other, as her bridegroom.

54. γαμβρὸc Ἐρεχθῆοc (Callim. fr. 86 Hollis = 321 Pf.) The myth is discussed by Hollis in his commentary to the *Hecale* p. 276.

55. Cf. G. Coppola, *Cirene ed il nuovo Callimaco* (Bologna, 1935), 84–86, D. A. Tsiribas "Καλλιμάχου Ἴαμβος κατὰ Εὐθυδήμου," *Athena* 59 (1955): 162.

56. The rich corrupter of Tibullus' love is a vivid figure of 1.9. On the many corresponsions of this poem and 1.4 with *Iambus* 3 see Dawson (1946) 11–13.

limachus uses μόχθηροc only once elsewhere, at *Ep.* 30 Pf. (12 G.-P.), there of an unhappy *erastes*. Very likely such a use is meant here, and the term is one of self-reference for the speaker, the "wretched" *erastes*.[57] Dawson assumes it to address Euthydemus. In either case the rich man of the Diegesis remains to be accounted for.

It is conceivable that the rich man appeared in the opening of the narrative, lines 24–25 and whatever may have immediately preceded 24.[58] The fact that Euthydemus (in the accusative) is here apparently the object of the actions of his mother is clearly suggestive. The adverb ὥc̣[π]ερ, if the correct reading, would appear to introduce a comparison of the actions of the mother of Euthydemus with those delineated in the immediately preceding line(s), now all but completely lost. The scholion that appears in the margin of *P. Oxy.* 1011 prior to line 24[59] is at once tantalizing and completely frustrating; almost nothing conclusive can be drawn from it for the text.

Callimachus' constitution of his erotic persona in these lines is one of the poem's most striking features. Particularly significant phrases and images are the following: line 32 θεοὺc ἀπρηγεῦνταc [the gods doing nothing], paralleled in Callimachean epigram in the oaths spoken in love that do not reach the ears of the gods; line 33 μόχθηροc [wretch], a term Callimachus uses in epigram in the sense of one wretched in love; line 38 μάργοc [horny madman]. Finally there is line 39 ἤνευcα, which is very likely a sexual *double entendre* creating a close confluence of libido and art. Yet the creation of this erotic persona can perhaps as well be perceived in the larger nature of the second part of the poem with its first person reminiscence of erotic betrayal, its unreal wish to not have loved, and the tone of resignation at the end. The poet's importation of the cults of Cybele and of Adonis into these final lines is remarkable especially for the aspects of gender confusion and social marginalization. The poet's suffering and the representation of his suffering result from his unrequited desire for Euthydemus. The poet's thought that he would have better been a eunuch or a woman introduces a degree of gender inversion that is remarkable in and of itself, and for its recurrence in Latin erotic poetry. Here Callimachus pre-

57. μοχθηρός can, of course, also be used of a term of abuse. At Ar. *Ach.* 165, Pl. *Phaedr.* 268e the term is one of pitying; at Ar. *Frogs* 1175 one of abuse.

58. This is suggested also by Dawson (1946) 6, although I do not follow his reconstruction of the lines.

59. *Schol. ante* **24** *in marg. sup. fol. IVr P. Oxy.* 1011 .ʹ. . παρ . . φ . . . . ωc c[. . . .] . . α ἐπιc[. . .]εται δ(ὲ) κυρίωc ἡ μὲν ἐπὶ τῶν καλῶc ἰ] . . . . [. .]o̱δ̣[.] . . . . [. . . .]δ᾽ ἐ[π]ὶ τῶν ἀναγκαζομένων ὃ ἄλλωc φαρμα[κευομέν]ων (suppl. Crusius) Especially tantalizing here is the final φαρμα with the suggestion of the imagery of either literal or metaphorical bewitchment.

figures Tibullus' development of this feature in his imitation of this poem in his Marathus elegy (particularly line 70 *et secet ad Phrygios vilia membra modos*), and especially Catullus 63. Callimachus assumes a variety of voices in his extant verse: a lock of hair (fr. 110), statues (e.g. *Iambus* 7), and a seemingly female ritual leader (*Hy.* 6), among others. So striking in *Iambus* 3 is the direct evocation of gender fluidity. Further these images of other-gendered utterance, the revelry of Cybele's eunuch priests and female lament, develop a strong contrast with the speaker's final resignation to poetic speech. Finally the evocation of the socially marginalized figures of *Galli* and women underscores the theme of marginalization that runs throughout the poem.

Line 32 θεοὺc ἀπρηγεῦνταc [the gods doing nothing] is a conjectured reading by von Arnim and Housman for the difficult ἀπρηγεῦνται of the papyrus.[60] The verb ἀπραγέω is not attested in the middle voice, and the introduction of a third person plural agent at this point in the text, where the agent is repeatedly first person, would be awkward. The phrase is contested in the scholarship on the poem. Dawson retains the ἀπρηγεῦνται of the papyrus, and sees here a disregard of the gods: "All that seems clear [26–33] is that good upbringing and high ideals are of no value when mankind cheerfully disregards the gods and breaks solemn pledges."[61] Recently O. Nikitinski has taken a different view of this image, as emblematic of Callimachus' "playful treatment" ("spielerische Behandlung") of the gods.[62] Nikitinski compares this passage with *Aet.* fr. 75.4–9. I am less sure of the strength of this parallel. The passage from *Aet.* fr. 75, *Acontius and Cydippe,* is modeled on Pindaric "Abbruchsformeln" in the treatment of mythological narrative; I do not think that is what is at issue here. A better comparison can perhaps be made with the unresponsive gods of Hipponax frr. 34 W. (43 Deg.), 36 W. (44 Deg.) and 38 W. (47 Deg.). Gods who do not respond to the prayers or desires of the iambic poet may well be a *topos* of the genre, indicative of the poet's marginal position.

D'Alessio suggests that this phrase may rather be a recurrence of the erotic *topos* that the oaths of those in love do not reach the ears of the gods.[63] "Gli dèi rimangono tranquilli non tanto secondo una con-

60. See Pfeiffer in his commentary ad loc.

61. Dawson (1950) 38. See also Dawson (1946) 7.

62. *Kallimachos-Studien* (Frankfurt am Main, 1996) 26: "Der Schluß liegt nahe, daß der Dichter vielmehr rein spielerisch über seine momentane Verwirrung spricht, in die er geraten oder fast geraten ist. Es gibt auch keinen Widerspruch mit der sonst oft betonten 'Frömmigkeit': Der Dichter ist fromm, aber er ist momentan schwach geworden und fast im Begriffe, die Götter zu lästern."

63. D'Alessio (1996) 599, n. 58.

cezione epicurea, ma perché i giuramenti d'amore non arrivano alle loro orecchie." D'Alessio points to the parallel of Callim. *Ep.* 25 (G.-P. 11) 3–4: ὤμοcεν· ἀλλὰ λέγουcιν ἀληθέα τοὺc ἐν ἔρωτι | ὅρκουc μὴ δύνειν οὔατ' ἐc ἀθανάτων [he swore, but they say truthfully that oaths spoken in love do not reach the ears of the immortals]. Indeed in *Iambus* 3 Callimachus often combines the language and imagery of traditional iambic and erotic verse (especially epigram). It is very likely that θεοὺc ἀπρηγεῦνταc is a result of this combining of genres.

The end of line 33 μόχθηροc ἐξεκνήμωc [wretch destroyed] is problematic. It is unclear who is meant by μόχθηροc.[64] Nikitinski suggests it refers to the narrator, which has two advantages.[65] There is, indeed, a repeated presence of the first person narrator in the surrounding lines, and Pfeiffer was surely correct in his original assessment that the poetic narrator from line 30 on is speaking of himself. Further, μόχθηροc in the sense of "wretched" fits the imagery of Callimachus here and elsewhere of those disappointed in love.

Unaccented, μοχθηροc can be used in two senses, as one who is wretched, who suffers misfortune (later accented conventionally μόχθηρος[66]), and one who is a wretch, who causes misfortune (later accented conventionally μοχθηρός). The former is logically the sense here if drawn to the person of the poetic narrator. Indeed, these last lines of the poem develop an increasing sense of self-pity that culminates in the final tone of lament and resignation at the end. Callimachus uses

64. The masculine nominative adjective μόχθηροc and the finite verb occupy the last two metra of the choliambic line with the last syllable missing (⏑⏑–|⏑⏑–). The metrical *sedes* of the missing last syllable of the line (allowing for *brevis in longo*) would theoretically permit any of the following in apposition to the figure designated as μόχθηροc: 1st pers. sing. (the poetic narrator) ἐξεκνήμωcα; 2nd pers. sing. (addressed to Euthydemus) ἐξεκνήμωcαc (although here admittedly one might expect rather the vocative μόχθηρε); 3rd pers. sing. (spoken by the poetic narrator of Euthydemus) ἐξεκνήμωcε. Dawson (1950) 37 assumes the last: "the scoundrel broke his word." So too does D'Alessio (1996) 599 "(. . .) perfido mandò (?) in malora (il giuramento ?)."

65. Nikitinski (1996) 27: "In V. 33 (] . . μοχθηρος εξεκνημως . []), den ich als μόχθηρος ἐξεκνήμωσα lese, wird anscheinend der Gedanke des V. 32 fortgesetzt: der Dichter bezeichnet sich selbst mit Sympathie als μόχθηρος 'Elender', der etwas verkehrt gemacht hat—wahrscheinlich hinsichtlich der Götter, die er in seinem Unglück lästerte. Dawson . . . bezieht V. 33 auf Euthydemos, der seine Versprechen nicht gehalten, sondern 'gebrochen' (ἐξεκνήμωσε) hat. Dies ist unwahrscheinlich, weil Kallimachos schon in V. 30 seinen Exkurs über Euthydemos beendet hat und bis zum Ende des Gedichtes über sich selbst spricht. Die Änderung des Subjektes inmitten dieser Rede von sich selbst hat wegen Platzmangels nur geringe Wahrscheinlichkeit (dies gilt natürlich nur, wenn wir auch annehmen, daß V. 32 nicht ein Exkurs über die moderne Gesellschaft darstellt, die sich um Götter nicht kümmert . . . sondern daß der Dichter über sich selbst spricht . . .)."

66. Accentuation, of course, obviates the ambiguity present in the unaccented form, an ambiguity which the poet might intentionally evoke.

the adjective in the same sense in another homoerotic poem, *Ep.* 30 Pf. (12 G.-P.):

Θεccαλικὲ Κλεόνικε, τάλαν τάλαν, οὐ μὰ τὸν ὀξύν
ἥλιον, οὐκ ἔγνων· cχέτλιε, ποῦ γέγοναc;
ὀcτέα coι καὶ μοῦνον ἔτι τρίχεc· ἦ ῥά ce δαίμων
οὐμὸc ἔχει, χαλεπῇ δ' ἤντεο θευμορίῃ;
ἔγνων· Εὐξίθεόc ce cυνήρπαce, καὶ cὺ γὰρ ἐλθών
τὸν καλόν, ὦ μόχθηρ', ἔβλεπεc ἀμφοτέροιc.

Thessalian Cleonicus, poor wretch, poor wretch, by the harsh sun, I did not recognize you. Sorry man, where have you been?
Of you only bones and hair remain. Does my *daimon* hold you, and have you met with a harsh lot from the gods?
I recognize it—Euxitheus has caught you up, for you too came and looked, wretched man, upon the handsome one with both eyes.

There are many resonances of erotic epigram in *Iambus* 3, especially in the presentation of the first person voice. The parallel use of μόχθηρος is a further moment in generic confluence.

Lines 34–39 constitute an elaborate, self-ironic, unreal wish that encompasses a series of images at once ecstatic/cultic and differently gendered. Each moment in the process of the evolution of this unreal wish moves seemingly farther from the speaker's present stance of rejected (if rational and well-educated) male, only to culminate, surprisingly, in the sexual *double entendre* of the poem's closing lines.

This wish begins at line 34 μοι τοῦτ' ἂν ἦν ὀνήϊc[το]ν [this would have been best for me]. The verb ὀνίνημι and the derived adjective ὀνήϊcτοc are rare in Callimachus' extant verse. The adjective occurs once elsewhere, at *Iambus* 5.4 οὐχ ὡc ὀνήιcτον . ι[. The central focus of *Iambus* 5 is also sexual behavior. There are a number of verbal parallels between these two poems. In both passages the speaker is concerned with deflection from a certain behavior—in *Iambus* 3 his own, and in *Iambus* 5 that of his addressee. The only other occurrence of the verb ὀνίνημι is at fr. 75.6 in the poet's chiding self-address.[67] Both this passage from *Aetia* 3 and the concluding lines of *Iambus* 3 are, albeit differently, forms of self-address, and both are concerned with religious cults and phrased as unreal statements.

The goddess Cybele appears to have been a significant figure in Hipponax' poetry.[68] Both the cults of Cybele and Adonis are from the

67. See above ch. 1, p. 52, n. 65.

68. Cf. fr. 127 W. (125 Deg.) καὶ Διὸς κούρη Κυβήβη καὶ Θρεϊκίη Βενδῖς and fr. 156 W. (167 Deg.) (I) Tzetz. *ad Lyc.* 1170 p. 339, 15–17 Scheer 'στερρὰν κύβηλιν' · ἰσχυρὸν

Near East in origin, and would have been familiar to him. While the pairing of the two cults in the context of *Iambus* 3 has particularly Hellenistic overtones, as a poetic feature, it may be of earlier origin. To cast the hair back (line 35 τὴν κόμην ἀναρρίπτειν) is a gesture of ecstatic cult attested for both sexes, and, as Pfeiffer notes, particularly for the cults of Dionysus and Cybele.[69] The speaker introduces both cults synecdochically through a representative verbal action (τὴν κόμην ἀναρρίπτειν, ἢ ποδῆρες ἕλκοντα . . . ἰηλεμίζειν·), and the final long syllables in lines 35 and 36 underscore the images of disarray. The simplicity of the single verbal action contrasts with the shocking wish it represents, to be a eunuch or a woman. The speaker first wishes vainly that he had been a Gallus, a eunuch priest of Cybele, for as a Gallus he would not have been entangled with Euthydemus.

At lines 37–38 ᾽Άδω[ν]ιν αἰαῖ, τῆς θεοῦ τὸν ἄνθρωπον, | ἰηλεμίζειν [to cry, alas Adonis, follower of the goddess] the narrator of the previous homoerotic scene wishes himself a further remove from the state of *erastes* than that of the eunuch priest of Cybele. He would rather as a woman cry the ritual lament for Adonis.[70] The accusative ᾽Άδωνιν is a cult formula that directly evokes the rite of the Adonis.[71] Callimachus here not only evokes the rite itself, but imports the sound, as he does with the Phrygian flute of Cybele's worship at line 36. If we understand τὸν ἄνθρωπον in apposition to ᾽Άδω[ν]ιν, the translation "husband" is perhaps better than "slave" as suggested by Pfeiffer.[72] Indeed τῆς θεοῦ τὸν ἄνθρωπον is then an effective *double entendre,* underscored here by

---

πέλεκυν. ὁ Ἱππῶναξ Κύβηλιν τὴν Ῥέαν λέγει, παρὰ τὸ ἐν Κυβέλλᾳ (Κυβέλᾳ Br. 1 42) πόλει Φρυγίας τιμᾶσθαι. ‖ (II) cf. Steph. Byz. (389, 9–12 Mein.) Κυβέλεια· πόλις Ἰωνίας . . . ἔστι καὶ Κύβελλα Φρυγίας. καὶ Κύβελλον (Κύβελα Hemst.) ὄρος ἱερόν, ἀφ᾽ οὗ Κυβέλη ἡ Ῥέα λέγεται ⟨καὶ⟩ (add. Horkel) Κυβεληγενὴς καὶ Κυβελίς (Κυβιλίς **V,** Κυβηλίς **R** [ad η sscr. ι). Πείσανδρος δεκάτῳ (fr. 9 Heitsch).

69. Cf. Eur. *Bacch.* 150 (of Dionysus) τρυφερόν ⟨τε⟩ πλόκαμον εἰς αἰθέρα ῥίπτων. 864–65 δέραν | εἰς αἰθέρα δροσερὸν ῥίπτουσ᾽ (with Dodds' note) Ar. *Lys.* 1311 ταὶ δὲ κόμαι σείονθ᾽ ἅπερ βακχᾶν.

70. On the association of the cry αἰαῖ with Adonis see J. D. Reed, *Bion of Smyrna: The Fragments and the Adonis* (Cambridge, 1997), 194. For the verb ἰηλεμίζειν cf. *SH* 254 [Pf. fr. 383.16], Theocr. *Id.* 15.98 ἰάλεμος, with Gow's note ad loc.

71. Cf. Sappho fr. 168 L.-P. ὦ τὸν ᾽Άδωνιν, Ar. *Lys.* 393 αἰαῖ ᾽Άδωνιν. See J. D. Reed, "The Sexuality of Adonis," *CA* 14.2 (1995): 333–34.

72. See on this line also D'Alessio (1996) 599, n. 59. Syntactically the phrase τῆς θεοῦ τὸν ἄνθρωπον could be in apposition to poet as male speaker, the (understood) accusative subject of the infinitive ἰηλεμίζειν (as ἕλκοντα line 36); this is, however, extremely unlikely. There is no convincing evidence for men in Hellenistic Alexandria taking part in the cult of Adonis, a cult in the classical period exclusively the realm of women. It is not clear that the male speakers of Theocr. *Id.* 15 (᾽Αδωνιάζουσαι) lines 72, 74, and 87–88 (the two ξένοι) in fact take part in the rituals described at lines 132–35 and 143–44 (see Gow to line 143 εὐθυμεύσαις). Cf. however Dover (1971) 209.

the word order. The women of the Adonis cult of Theocr. *Id.* 15.134 are imagined by the singer of the second part of the poem as λύσασαι δὲ κόμαν καὶ ἐπὶ σφυρὰ κόλπον ἀνεῖσαι [with our hair loosened and the folds of our dresses cast to our ankles]. This last appears to be the aspect Callimachus is reflecting with the phrase ἢ ποδῆρεϲ ἕλκοντα of line 36. All of the verbal actions of the speaker's wish reflect a transition not only into other-gendered roles but also into irrational, disordered cultic behavior.

The poem closes with a note of resignation at once ironic and erotic, poignant and biting. With the adversative νῦν δ' (line 38) the poet presents a strong, even shocking alternative to his previously imagined versions of himself as a eunuch or a woman. He is rather now a μάργοϲ [lecher], which I have rendered "horny madman." The translators of this poem have largely overlooked the probable sense of μάργοϲ here: so Dawson and Trypanis "fool that I was," Clayman "mad;" D'Alessio is nearer the mark with "insaziabile," Pfeiffer well suggests "libidinosus." In fact the adjective μάργος indicating sexual intemperance is widely attested in Greek literature.[73] The use of the substantive μάργοϲ in *Iambus* 3 is particularly effective in that this too is a marginalized or rather debased figure.[74] Indeed, lines 38–39 νῦν δ' ὁ μάργοϲ ἐϲ Μούϲαϲ | ἔνευϲα· [but now a horny madman I have inclined to the Muses] are structured in careful opposition to the imagined existences of lines 35–38: general description (rather than characteristic feature), verbal action, deity in regard to whom this verbal action takes place. The poet as μάργοϲ is put on a par with the ecstatic eunuch and the lamenting woman, the Muses on a par with Cybele and Adonis. This opposition climaxes in the sexual *double entendre* implicit in line 39 ἔνευϲα.[75] A sexual connotation of the verb νεύω fits well with μάργοϲ; the tone is indeed one of resignation, but is at the same time heavily self-ironic (a signal feature of Callimachus' erotic epigrams). The Muses have a dual valence here as sources of poetic inspiration, and metaphor for Calli-

73. Cf. *Theogn.* 581–82 ἐχθαίρω δὲ γυναῖκα περίδρομον, ἄνδρά τε μάργον, | ὃϲ τὴν ἀλλοτρίην βούλετ' ἄρουραν ἀροῦν, Aesch. *Suppl.* 741–42 ἐξῶλέϲ ἐϲτι μάργον Αἰγύπτου γένοϲ | μάχηϲ τ' ἄπληϲτον, Eur. *El.* 1027–28 νῦν δ' οὔνεχ' Ἑλένη μάργοϲ ἦν ὅ τ' αὖ λαβὼν | ἄλοχον κολάζειν προδότιν οὐκ ἠπίϲτατο.

74. On Callimachus and the Homeric *Margites* see fr. 397 Pf. The hero of the *Margites* is also, of course, a socially debased figure.

75. Cf. the anonymous trimeter (*TrGF* 355) cited by Plutarch (*De aud. poet.* 12 p. 34A, *Amator.* 21 p. 766F) πρὸϲ θῆλυ νεύει μᾶλλον ἢ ' πὶ τἄρρενα. Maas (cited by Pfeiffer Add. et Corr. I 505) thought this trimeter to be from a satyr play, pointing to Eur. *Cycl.* 583–84 ἥδομαι δέ πωϲ | τοῖϲ παιδικοῖϲι μᾶλλον ἢ τοῖϲ θήλεϲιν, where see Seaford in his commentary to these lines. A different sexual image with this verb occurs at Hdt. 2.48.2 νεῦον τὸ αἰδοῖον.

machus' poetic composition;[76] in effect the poet, unable to undo his wronged state through altered gender, has turned to composing iambic poetry.[77]

The poetic voice of *Iambus* 3 presents a linked relationship of poetry, poverty, and love. Poetry constrains him to be poor, poverty excludes him from love, and love in turn is in some erotic fashion supplanted by poetry. Here we would so like to be able to supplement with surety the lacuna in the last line of our text; the suggested proverbial closing "therefore what I have kneaded, I shall dine upon" is very likely.[78] All three expressions μάργος, ἔνευσα, and ἔμαξα[79] have sexual connotations that bring the poem to a fittingly biting conclusion.[80] The poet then turns not to ecstatic cult utterance as a eunuch or a woman, but to composing invective verse. So Callimachus, in portraying another singer, the Cyclops of *Ep.* 46.3–6 Pf. (3 G-P.), represents poverty, love, and song:

αἰ Μοῖσαι τὸν ἔρωτα κατισχναίνοντι, Φίλιππε·
ἦ πανακὲς πάντων φάρμακον ἁ σοφία.
τοῦτο, δοκέω, χὰ λιμὸς ἔχει μόνον ἐς τὰ πονηρά
τὠγαθόν· ἐκκόπτει τὰν φιλόπαιδα νόσον.

The Muses, Philippos, reduce the swelling of love;
indeed poetic skill is the all healing remedy for all things.
This, I think, is the only good hunger has against its misfortunes.
It cuts away the boy-loving disease.

The presence of epigram in *Iambus* 3 is multivalent, and integral to the poet's construction of his erotic persona. The treatment of the erotic in iambic poetry has its own tradition, and this genre as the medium of censure for sexual behavior in the Hellenistic period is pre-figured by the censure of Bupalus and Arete, and Neoboule and Lycambes in the poetry of Hipponax and Archilochus. The sexual censuring of *Iambus* 3 is surely in part informed by this traditional iambic strategy, and in this light we may appreciate the diegete's summary of this part of the poem: παρεπι | κόπτει δὲ καὶ Εὐθύδημόν τινα, ὡς | κεχρημένον τῇ ὥρᾳ πορισμῷ [and he reproves further a certain Euthydemus, on the

76. Cf. fr. 75.76–77 ἔνθεν ὁ πα[ι]δός | μῦθος ἐς ἠμετέρην ἔδραμε Καλλιόπην [from there the boy's story ran to my Calliope].

77. In this metapoetic comment Callimachus especially prefigures Catullus.

78. Macarius, *Paroemiographi Graeci* II 171: Ἤν τις ἔμαξε μᾶζαν ταύτην καὶ ἐσθιέτω.

79. On μᾶζα and μάσσω connoting anal intercourse see Henderson (1975) 200–201.

80. There is no explicit referent for the relative ἥν in the lines immediately preceding, but a very likely possibility is that μᾶζα is understood, cf. *Iambus* 5.7 μᾶζα. There are many moments of recall between the two poems.

grounds that he makes use of his beauty for profit]. However, the treatment of the erotic theme in *Iambus* 3 and the tone of the erotic voice have a closer parallel in the pathos and humor of Callimachean homoerotic[81] epigram.

The homoerotic epigram is characterized by a number of typical themes, images, and statements that constitute something of a subgenre.[82] Settings evoked are frequently those of aristocratic *paideia,* the gymnasium and symposium. The love of the *erastes* is portrayed as intensely desirous and promiscuous, the *eromenos* frequently as harsh and unyielding or greedy. Both the desire of the *erastes* and the beauty of the *eromenos* are ephemeral. While Callimachus' erotic epigrams adhere to many of the conventional features of this genre, his self-referential poetic persona is the distinctive feature of these verses, a feature that George Walsh has well characterized as "audible thought.[83] *Ep.* 32 Pf. (G.-P. 7) is an excellent example.

Οἶδ' ὅτι μευ πλούτου κενεαὶ χέρες· ἀλλὰ, Μένιππε,
μὴ λέγε πρὸς Χαρίτων τοὐμὸν ὄνειρον ἐμοί.
ἀλγέω τὴν διὰ παντὸς ἔπος τόδε πικρὸν ἀκούων·
ναὶ φίλε, τῶν παρὰ σεῦ τοῦτ' ἀνεραστότατον.

I know that my hands are empty of wealth. Just the same,
Menippus, don't, by the Graces,[84] tell my own dream to me.
On hearing this bitter word I am in intense pain.[85]
Yes, my friend, of everything from you this is the most unloving.

The themes of this quatrain are those of *Iambus* 3: the mercenary *eromenos,* the poverty of the speaker, the final bitter note of the *erastes.* Also similar is the reactive quality of the poem. The *eromenos* is traditionally (although not always) the object of pursuit, the recipient of erotic action, whereas here it is the *erastes* who is the recipient and subsequently the sufferer. Each line of the quatrain develops an inversion of the traditional pattern of pursuer and pursued—the *erastes* is at the

81. It is generally assumed that the erotic poetry of Callimachus, unlike, e.g., that of Theocritus or Meleager, is exclusively homoerotic. While I would agree that it is largely so, there are some passages, e.g. fr. 110 and fr. 556, where Callimachus is both narrating and as narrative voice taking part in a story of heterosexual love. The story of Acontius and Cydippe (frr. 67–75) is more complex, one which combines both homoerotic and heterosexual images and motifs.

82. See F. Buffière in his preface to the Budé *Anthologie grecque,* vol. 11 "L'Éros des garçons dans le livre XII," pp. xxxix–lx. ed. R. Aubreron, F. Buffière, and J. Irgoin.

83. "Surprised by Self: Audible Thought in Hellenistic Poetry," *CP* 85 (1990): 1–21.

84. The Graces in this context are worth noting, in a line immediately following on the reference to the poet's poverty, a variation on the association of Theocr. *Id.* 16.

85. See G.-P. II 162 on τὴν διὰ παντός.

end ironically the recipient of that which is ἀνεραστότατον [the most unloving][86]—Callimachus' own verbal play on the inversion of roles he has evoked in the epigram.

The delineation of suffering *erastes* in the serio-ironic *Ep.* 41 Pf. (G.-P. 4) is similar.[87]

Ἥμισύ μευ ψυχῆς ἔτι τὸ πνέον, ἥμισυ δ' οὐκ οἶδ'
εἴτ' Ἔρος εἴτ' Ἀΐδης ἥρπασε, πλὴν ἀφανές.
ἦ ῥά τιν' ἐς παίδων πάλιν ᾤχετο; καὶ μὲν ἀπεῖπον
πολλάκι· 'τὴν δρῆστιν μὴ ὑποδέχεσθε νέοι.'
Θεύτιμον δίφησον· ἐκεῖσε γὰρ ἡ λιθόλευστος
κείνη καὶ δύσερως οἶδ' ὅτι που στρέφεται.

Half of my soul yet is a breathing thing, and half I know not
whether Love or Hades has snatched it, but that it is vanished.
Has it gone back to some one of the boys? And yet frequently
I warned, "Young men, do not receive the runaway."
Seek it at Theutimus'. For I know that one, my soul, wanders
somewhere near there, deserving to be stoned and sick in love.

Here too we observe several of the features of *Iambus* 3: the framed past dialogue, the metaphor of slavery (this early instance of the *servitium amoris* is striking), the tone of resignation at the end. The figure of the *erastes* is again rendered impotent. Whereas in the previous epigram his poverty made him the object of lovelessness, of the ἀνεραστότατον, here his desire is cast in the imagery of the runaway slave (a precursor to the *servitium amoris* in Roman elegy). The gender of τὴν δρῆστιν [the runaway], while applied in one sense to the poet's ψυχή, [soul], is, referring by metonomy to himself, a striking moment of inversion. A degree of self-irony is present throughout the poem, heightened in the final juxtaposition of λιθόλευστος [deserving to be stoned] and δύσερως [sick in love].[88]

Characteristic of Callimachus' erotic verse are self-irony, a certain quality of detached resignation (much of Callimachus' erotic verse is presented as musings upon *faits accomplis*), and a portrayal of the *erastes* as victim of his own desires. This is a portrayal common in homoerotic epigram, but one given a different quality here by the slight self-mock-

86. Noteworthy here is the contrast of μευ line 1 and σεῦ line 4, the movement "of me" to "from you" underscoring the inversion of roles of actor and acted upon.

87. The text is that of Gow-Page. See their comments, II 159 on line 5 Θεύτιμον δίφησον.

88. Callimachus may be playing with one or more of the possible meanings of στρέφεται here, which may be used as a wrestling term and would thus be appropriate to the gymnasium, or may be a term used for pain and would thus continue the motifs both of the ἐρωτικὴ νόσος and of the penalties implied with δρῆστιν and λιθόλευστος.

ery of the Callimachean poetic voice. In *Iambus* 3, in choliambic, and so Hipponactean verse, and with some Hipponactean language, Callimachus has brought the world of epigram into iambic poetry. And he has, as so often elsewhere in the *Iambi,* achieved an interweaving of poetic genres and borrowed from the past to create something new as he has done in constructing the figure of the educated *erastes.*

Poverty as a mark of the poetic speaker's social circumstances is a feature of the archaic iambic poet's portrayed social marginalization. Ethical criticism of others, and ethical criticism pointing to or couched in terms of their sexual behavior, is also a stock theme of the poetry of Archilochus and Hipponax. Callimachus develops these themes in *Iambus* 3 through the contemporary artistic concern for patronage, and for artistic recognition. At the same time his self-ironic lamentations are a feature of his own erotic voice, and a characteristic of his self-delineation as a rejected, and rejecting, *erastes. Iambus* 3 is a confluence of several eras and several poetic genres, and in this regard is emblematic of the *Iambi* as a collection. The poem is emblematic of the reinvention of iambic poetry in this period, of the self-portrayal of the poet and his profession, and of the fluid parameters of Callimachean erotic verse.

Iambus 5

INTRODUCTION

Both *Iambi* 3 and 5 are concerned with the sexual behavior of another individual. The poetic voice in both poems is an ethically critical one. The stance of the poetic "I" in regard to this behavior in the two poems is, however, different, as is the nature of the sexual criticism.

The poet of *Iambus* 3 is directly involved with the behavior of Euthydemus. He is the victim of the young man's actions, and the concluding line is a comment on the poet's own resignation. He is a central figure in his own erotic narrative. There are parallels for this poetic structure in both Archilochus and Hipponax;[89] at the same time the overtones of contemporary elegy and especially epigram are very strong. In the case of *Iambus* 5, however, the poetic "I" stands outside in the character of one giving warning and advice (so the Diegesis ἐν

89. E.g. the Cologne Epode of Archilochus (see J. Henderson, "The Cologne Epode and the Conventions of Early Greek Erotic Poetry," *Arethusa* 9, 2 [1976]: 159–79), Hipponax fr. 84 W. (86 Deg.).

ἤθει εὐνοίαc [in the guise of good intention]). Although the narrator appears repeatedly in the broken lines of the text, another's behavior is the apparent sole focus of the composition. Further, whereas Euthydemus appears in the third person in the poet's own narrative in *Iambus* 3, the subject of criticism of *Iambus* 5 is the addressee.

The nature of the sexual criticism in the two poems is also different. Euthydemus' infidelity and betrayal have a monetary origin, and *Iambus* 3 is cast as a denunciation of a venal era, of which the venality of the beloved is an example. While the first person narrative of the boy's betrayal and the poet's reaction is the emotional high point of the poem, and this is couched in highly charged sexual imagery, nonetheless the criticism is of venality, and sexual behavior resulting from venality.[90]

The criticism of *Iambus* 5 is leveled directly (and apparently only) at sexual behavior, and that of a reprehensible nature—the abuse of pupils by their schoolteacher. Faulting an individual for sexual misdemeanor and shaming publicly another's sexual reputation, clearly have a long history in invective and related poetry; there are many surviving examples in the fragments of archaic iambic, as in the case of Archilochus and Lycambes and his daughters.[91] Their public reputations are vulnerable to the poet's verses, as both the testimonia[92] and the Cologne Epode[93] make clear. In the fragments of Hipponax both Bupalus and Arete are objects of sexual invective. Callimachus thus had before him a tradition of iambic poetry where not only sexual activity as material per se, but in particular publicly faulting another for it, was a staple of setting and genre. While this tradition is very much discernible in *Iambus* 5, Callimachus has refashioned it with variation of level and imagery, juxtaposing components drawn from several levels of poetic elevation in an epode that evolves into an educated admonition to the lecherous teacher.

Ethical criticism set in a frame purporting to be advice is also a tradition of archaic iambic.[94] The advice may be given in a variety of tones,

90. Cf. Bühler (1964) 242 on Dieg. VI 37–38 παρεπι | κόπτει δὲ καὶ Εὐθύδημόν τινα, although I think the force of the commentary text here may rather be that the Euthydemus episode comes second in the poem, not that it is meant to be given secondary importance.

91. See Nagy (1979) 245–46, A. P. Burnett, *Three Archaic Poets: Archilochus, Alcaeus, Sappho* (Cambridge, 1983), chapters 1 and 3 passim.

92. Collected by West (1971) prior to frr. 30–87 and 172–81 (the epodes). Again and again the aspect of public shame is foregrounded in the testimonia.

93. The Cologne Epode itself as a composition is a testimonium to a young girl's sexual activity before marriage.

94. And of earlier hexameter literature; so obviously Hesiod to his brother Perses in the *Works and Days,* also e.g. Odysseus to Euryalus in *Odyssey* 8.

jocular, serious, or threatening. Archilochus' didactic admonition to Lycambes (frr. 172–181 W.) is an example of this conceit. Lycambes' faithlessness is foregrounded in the same lines that urge him to reconsider the possible results of his actions. These fragments of Archilochus are also epodic. Hipponax fr. 118 W. (129 Deg.)[95] is also particularly noteworthy in its similarities to the opening of *Iambus* 5. It consists of the opening lines of an epode reconstructed from the fragments of an ancient commentary (*P. Oxy.* 2176). The poem is directed at a glutton, to whom the poet proffers advice lest his already wasted addressee be overtaken by a stomach ailment.[96]

ὦ Σάνν', ἐπειδὴ ῥῖνα θεό[συλιν φορ]εῖς
καὶ γαστρὸς οὐ κατακρα[τεῖς,
λαιμᾶι δέ σοι τὸ ιχεῖ]λος ὡς ιἐρωιδιοῦ
[ ]
τοῦς μοι παράσχες [ ]
σύν τοί τι βουλεῦσαι θέ[λω.
(. . . .)
τοὺς] βρα[χίονας
καὶ τὸ]ν τράχ[ηλον ἔφθισαι,
κα[τεσθίεις δέ·] μή σε γαστρίη [λάβηι
[ ]
πρῶτον μὲν ἐκδὺς νεῖμ[ον], αὐλήσει δέ σοι
Κίκων τὸ Κωδάλο[υ μέλος

O Sannus, since you [grow] an [un]holy nose,
and have no control over your belly,
and your lip is greedy like a heron's[97]
[ ]
give me your ear, [ ]
[I] wish to give you some advice.
(. . . .)
]in your arms
]and neck [you waste away,
but you gorge]. Lest stomach-ache [overtake] you
[ ]
first undress and [gesticulate?], and Kikon will play
the [song] of Kodalus for you on the oboe.

95. See West (1974) 147–48, Degani ad loc.

96. γαστρίη glossed by the commentator as στρόφο[ν λέγει καὶ γ]αστρὸς ἀλγηδό[να (supple. West). Both West (1974) 147 and Degani in his app. crit. draw attention to the description of Erysichthon's punishment in Callim. *Hy.* 6.88–89, 92–93 κακὰ δ' ἐξάλλετο γαcτήρ | αἰεὶ μᾶλλον ἔδοντι . . . ἔτι μέζον ἐτάκετο, μέcτ' ἐπὶ νεύροιc | δειλαίῳ ῥινόc τε καὶ ὀcτέα μῶνον ἐλείφθη. See Hopkinson (1988) to these lines. Certainly both Hipponax and Callimachus are manipulating medical imagery and terminology.

97. The greedy heron may be a precursor to the ibis of Callimachus' poem of the same name.

R. Kassel in a short essay[98] first suggested that this epodic fragment of Hipponax might be the model for Callimachus' *Iambus* 5. In a 1964 study "Archilochos und Kallimachos," W. Bühler evolves a somewhat more detailed comparison of the two pieces.[99] Both studies underline a certain amount of Callimachean variation and even "one-upmanship" of the original in Callimachus' use of the choliambic meter in his epode. I address several parallel features of the two poems in the following pages. I draw attention here to the larger generic parallel that may indicate a type of model for Callimachus' poem, whether or not he in fact had this particular poem in mind.[100] As Bühler has noted, both poems open with a direct address, both express an explicit wish to give advice, both urge the attention of the addressee, and both give a causal sentence with ἐπεί expressing the ground for which advice is needed. In both poems the possibility of punishment for inattention to the advice is also directly raised.[101] There remain marked differences in theme and structure. These differences may suggest a common generic model rather than a more interdependent relationship between these two pieces. It is nonetheless essential in assessing Callimachus' use of the archaic past that in composing poems cast as ethical advice (in stichic choliambic lines as *Iambus* 1 or epodic as *Iambus* 5) Callimachus had a poetic model in Hipponax.

Iambus 5 is a poem of some sixty-eight lines, most of them fragmentary. Of the last half of the poem only the opening several syllables of each line are extant; *P. Oxy.* 2171, fr. 1, 1–9 preserves the end of nine verses between lines 35 and 53. *Iambus* 5 is the first of the three epodic

98. R. Kassel, "Kleinigkeiten zu den Kallimachos-Fragmenten," *Rh.M.* 101 (1958): 235–38. Kassel refers (235) to the relationship of the two compositions as one of "überraschend weitgehende Imitatio."

99. W. Bühler, "Archilochos und Kallimachos," in *Archiloque,* Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique 10 (Geneva: 1964), 225–47.

100. So Kassel (1958) 236: "Auch die weitere formale Struktur der beiden Gedichtanfänge zeigt, soweit sie der trümmerhafte Textbestand erkennen läßt, eine so auffallende Übereinstimmung, daß an einen Zufall kaum zu denken ist." Cf. Bühler (1964) 237: "Nach allem scheint mir die Annahme nahe zu liegen, dass Kallimachos den Anfang des Hipponax gedichtes vor Augen hatte." I suspect rather that most of the parallel features of the two works could be of a type, the epodic invective poem framed as advice; that the addressees are faulted for different "sins" (gluttony, sexual incontinence) is not insignificant.

101. Bespeaking the quite different levels of tone in the two poems; Hipponax' μή σε γαστρίη [λάβηι is immediately and vividly pertinent to this context of gluttony, Callimachus' ὣς δ' ἄν σε θωϊὴ λάβοι rather alludes to the language of earlier poetry (θωή is used infrequently in Homer), and does not in and of itself specify the punishment. There is a comparable delay in specifying the penalty at Callim. *Hy.* 6.65–67 ἁ μὲν τόσσ' εἰποῖς' Ἐρυσίχθονι τεῦχε πονηρά. | αὐτίκα οἱ χαλεπόν τε καὶ ἄγριον ἔμβαλε λιμόν | αἴθωνα κρατερόν. . . .

poems, composed with variation of dialect and meter. The meter of *Iambus* 5, choliambic lines alternating with iambic dimeter, is itself, as has been frequently noted,[102] a bridge between the four earlier stichic choliambic poems and the more metrically varied epodes. There are other features that link the three epodic poems, three poems that on one level belong to varying generic types: ethical criticism (*Iambus* 5), real (or seeming) *propemptikon,* a send-off for a friend, (*Iambus* 6), *aition* (*Iambus* 7). All three are in some sense didactic. Moreover in each of the three the poet plays with the conventions of didactic: the poet as seer in *Iambus* 5, the details of the statue of Olympian Zeus told to one going there in *Iambus* 6, the statue that tells its own biography in *Iambus* 7.

OCCASION (THE NAUGHTY SCHOOLTEACHER)

Iambus 5 is addressed to a schoolteacher (γραμματοδιδάcκαλοc), and advises him to cease taking sexual advantage (καταιcχύνοντα) of his pupils. Two aspects of this admonition are immediately striking, both foregrounding authorial and cultural variation from earlier models. The first is the inversion of the positive paiderastic educational relationship delineated in Plato's *Symposium.* Here in *Iambus* 5 the passion of the schoolteacher is rather represented as one that may incur penalty, and traditional poetic imagery of the erotic is evoked as a negative paradigm, the ember to be quelled, the horses to be held back from the race. Three of the *Iambi* (3, 5, and 9) develop, each differently, variations on the institution of *paiderasteia.*[103] In *Iambus* 3 the language of the relationship is applied to the *erastes,* in *Iambus* 9 the statue of Hermes, itself in its sexually aroused form emblematic of the erotic milieu of the wrestling school, charges the *erastes* of the boy Philetades with dishonorable intentions.[104] The other aspect I would highlight here is the place of literacy per se in the poem, an element that is evocative not of traditional iambic but of Callimachus' contemporary Alexan-

102. Dawson (1950) 62, 142, Clayman (1980) 29–30

103. Cf. also Dieg. VII 5–6 (to *Iambus* 4) Θρᾷκα δέ φηcιν αὐτὸν καθεcτά|ναι—παιδοκλέπτηc ἐcτί, and Pfeiffer's notes to these lines. It is unclear what role this aspect of the character so named had in *Iambus* 4, where (assuming the diegete to be summarizing sequentially) it would have arisen in the opening five lines. Pfeiffer suggested that παιδοκλέπτηc might be a reference (perhaps jocular) to the Cretan custom of "kidnapping" adolescent boys (cf. Ephor. *FGrH* 70 Fr. 149.21), which too is a reference to homoerotic *paideia.*

104. Dieg. VIII 39–40 ἐπὶ κακῷ δὲ αὐτὸν φιλεῖν τὸν | Φιλητάδαν [and further that he loves Philetades to bad purpose]. If Pfeiffer is correct in his suggestion that fr. 221 αἰτοῦμεν εὐμάθειαν Ἑρμᾶνοc δόcιν [we ask for facility in learning, the gift of Hermes], belongs to this poem, the evocation of homoerotic *paideia* is even more striking.

dria. The profession of a γραμματοδιδάcκαλοc, his pupils (Dieg. VII 22 τοὺc ἰδίουc μαθητάc), his profession (line 3 ἐπεί cε δαίμων ἄλφα βῆτ̣ι[α), and writing tablets (line 41 δέ̣λ̣τ̣οι) all represent a contemporary presence in a poetry that had, true, a tradition of representing simple occupations (e.g. the sweeper of Hippon. fr. 79 W. [79 Deg.]), but for which the figure of the schoolteacher is an innovation.

The Diegesis provides the poem's occasion and addressee, which both can be inferred at least in part from the poem's opening lines. A γραμματοδιδάcκαλοc is a children's schoolteacher.[105] The reference is a specific one (cf. φιλολόγουc Dieg. VI 3 [to *Iambus* 1]), and one which the diegete may have deduced from the text (cf. line 3 ἄλφα βῆτ̣ι[α). The papyrus reads]ι̣δαcκαλ[.]υ, which Kapsomenos would keep as δ]ι̣δαcκάλ[ο]υ ὄνομα [in the character (persona) of a schoolmaster], an interpretation that would import a seemingly second element of "masking" into this short summary, as the diegete's ἐν ἤθει εὐνοίαc [in the guise of good intention] is itself an interpretive comment on the stance of the poem's speaker.[106] The syntax, however, supports rather Lobel's restoration γραμματο[δ]ι̣δάcκαλον.

The diegete further comments that the name of the poem's addressee is contested (ὄνομα Ἀπολλώνι | ον, οἱ δὲ Κλέωνά τινα [by name Apollonius, but some say a certain Cleon]). The alternate names the diegete gives for the addressee indicate that the diegete did not know the name from the poem.[107] The poem's opening anonymous apostrophe ῾Ω ξεῖνε [O Friend] supports this deduction; compare Hippon. fr. 118.1 W. (129 Deg.) ὦ Σάνν'. Both Apollonius of Rhodes and Cleon of Curion (mentioned in the scholia to Apollonius[108]) were authors of an epic *Argonautica*. It is likely, but not certain, that these are the figures meant by the diegete here. It is, further, not certain that the latter is a contemporary of Callimachus.[109]

The diegete's ἰαμβίζει [he attacks in iambic fashion] probably

105. As distinct from a γραμματικός, a teacher of literature; the latter is the title attributed to Callimachus in most of the testimonia. The phrase γραμματοδιδάσκαλος is also used (cf. *P. Ryl.* 572) of certain Egyptian officials associated with temples. See H. Maehler, "Die griechische Schule im ptolemäischen Ägypten," in *Egypt and the Hellenistic World,* ed. E. van't Dack, P. van Dessel, and W. van Gucht (Louvain, 1983), 196–97.

106. S. G. Kapsomenos, "Zum Papyrus der Διηγήσεις der Gedichten des Kallimachos," *ByzZ* 16 (1939/40): 19.

107. See G. B. D'Alessio "Le Argonautiche di Cleone Curiense," *Quaderni dei Seminari Romani di Cultura Greca* 1 (2000): 106–7.

108. See *SH* 339A, Cameron (1995) 296, 342. On Cleon of Curion and his relationship to Apollonius see D'Alessio (1999).

109. See D'Alessio (2000) 101–7, on the chronology of the three poets Cleon, Apollonius, and Callimachus.

refers to the poem's subject matter rather than the meter.[110] *Iambus* 5 is the first poem of the collection that shows metrical variation, here with choliambs alternating with iambic dimeter. The diegete, however, shows no interest elsewhere in metrical type, hence ἰαμβίζει is probably better understood as synonymous to παρεπικόπτων (Dieg. VI 30), παρεπι | κόπτει (Dieg. VI 37–38) in the sense of "lampoons, satirizes."

According to the diegete, the poet attacks a schoolteacher for abusing τοὺc ἰδίουc μαθητάc [his own pupils]. This comment has provoked the question "whose pupils?" Does the diegete mean those of the poem's addressee or those of the poet? The latter interpretation[111] necessarily rests on the assumption that the information supplied by the *Suda* that Callimachus was himself a schoolteacher is historically accurate; I will return to this *Suda* entry momentarily. Surely, however, the effect of the admonishment and the sense of the metaphors of lines 23–29 are far stronger if the teacher-addressee's own pupils are at issue. καταισχύνειν is to shame sexually, either a woman[112] or a man.[113] Like *Iambus* 1,[114] *Iambus* 5 is characterized by the diegete as an admonishment to cease a blameworthy practice.

The diegete's interpretive phrase ἐν ἤθει εὐνοίαc [in the guise of good intention] is a problematic, if at the same time significant and tantalizing description of the poetic voice in this composition. J. Stroux took this phrase to be a reference to a feigned or assumed behavior of the poet[115] the phrase ἐν ἤθει is used in tragic scholia of stances actors assume on the stage. This is suggestive, especially when compared with

110. Cf. Arist. *Poet.* 1448b31–32 διὸ καὶ ἰαμβεῖον καλεῖται νῦν, ὅτι ἐν τῷ μέτρῳ τούτῳ ἰάμβιζον ἀλλήλους [wherefore it is called "iambic" now, because they lampooned one another in this meter]. On the vexed question whether "iambic" refers primarily to metrical type or subject material see Bühler (1964) passim, West (1974) 22–25.

111. Dawson (1950) 63: "The name of Callimachus' victim obviously was not given in the poem, as the uncertainty of the διηγητής shows, and it is not altogether clear whose pupils were abused; the word ἰδίους in the διήγησις may have been used clumsily to refer to pupils of Callimachus." Dawson is cited in part in turn by Clayman (1980) 30, n. 46.

112. Cf. Lys. 1.49 οἱ δ' ἀγῶνες δεινότεροι τοῖς ἀδικουμένοις καθεστήκασιν ἢ τοῖς παρὰ τοὺς νόμους τὰς ἀλλοτρίας καταισχύνουσι γυναῖκας [trials have become more terrible for those who are done wrong than for those who contrary to the laws shame other mens' wives]. J. Stroux, "Erzählungen aus Kallimachos," *Philologus* 89 (1934): 314–19 asserts that the verb καταισχύνειν is used specifically of homosexual behavior.

113. Cf. Dem. 45.79 τίνα τῆς πόλεως, ἧς αὐτὸς ἠξιώθην, καὶ τῆς ἐν αὐτῇ παρρησίας ἀπεστέρηκα, ὥσπερ σὺ τοῦτον ὃν κατῄσχυνας; [Whom have I deprived of the city, of which he was deemed worthy, and of the freedom of speech associated with it, as you have him whom you shamed?]

114. Cf. Dieg. VI 4–6 (to *Iambus* 1) ἥκου | cι δ'αὐτοῖc κατ' εἴλαc ἀπαγορεύει φθονεῖν | ἀλλήλοιc [When they come in swarms he enjoins them not to envy one another.]

115. J. Stroux (1934) 318: "Von den vielen Bedeutungen des ἦθος ist hier die auch in den guten Grammatikerscholien zu den *scaenici* vertretene der zum Schein ange-

the diegete's choice of expression of the poetic voice of *Iambus* 1 Ὑποτίθεται φθιτὸν Ἱππώνακτα cυγκαλοῦν | τα [He imagines the dead Hipponax summoning together], which can also be understood "He acts the part of the dead Hipponax summoning together." The diegete rarely comments in this way on the character (as opposed to the contents) of the poems. This comment to *Iambus* 5 is one of the few moments that suggests how the diegete reads the poems.

The phrase ἐν ἤθει εὐνοίαc is variously translated as "in the guise of a well-wisher" (Dawson and Trypanis), "with the intention to be useful" (Clayman), "in tono benevolo" (D'Alessio). The first of these is the more satisfactory, as it maintains the sense of "masked" behavior. The use of ἐν ἤθει with an abstract quality may at first sight seem unusual; the comment of the scholiast to Soph. *OT* 93, αὔξει δὲ ὁ ποιητὴς τὸ ὡς εὐνοϊκὸν ἦθος τοῦ Οἰδίποδος, is a noteworthy if not exact parallel.

The diegete's summary closes with notes of admonition and possible penalty: ἀπαγ[ο]ρεύων τού | το δρᾶν, μὴ ἁλῷ [urging him not to do this, lest he be caught]. Stroux suggested taking δρᾶν as the equivalent of Attic πράττειν with the sense of committing a homosexual act.[116] Clayman draws attention to Archil. fr. 119 W. δρήστην, and I would add *Iambus* 4.108 δρήcτηc.[117] However, there is no indication that Callimachus himself uses this verb in *Iambus* 5;[118] the Diegesis to the *Iambi* does not infrequently include citations other than the lemmata, but some caution is necessary in positing these. μὴ ἁλῷ either corresponds to line 22 ὥc] δ' ἄν cε θωϊὴ λάβοι or is a more general summary of the whole poem.

To summarize the material we may derive from the Diegesis on the poem's occasion. *Iambus* 5 is addressed to an unnamed schoolteacher, faults him for taking sexual advantage of his pupils, and in the guise of wishing him well advises him to cease to do so. Two features of this

---

nommenen Haltung zutreffend: in der (ironischen) Haltung, Ausdrucksweise, Maske der εὔνοια. Der Erzähler hat hier einmal—leider tut er es selten—charakterisiert und damit die Einheit des ironisch-beratenden Tones, der den Angegriffenen mehr demütigt als offenes Schelten, von der Anfangszeile bis zur Schlußwarnung bezeugt: für die Kunst kallimacheischer Ironie im γένος ein wertvolles Zeugnis." Stroux refers (ibid. n. 25) to the parallels Schol. Eur. *Hec.* 26 ἐν ἤθει καὶ εἰρωνείᾳ εἶπεν, Schol. Eur. *Or.* 750 ἐν ἤθει ταῦτα λέγει εἰρωνικῶς.

116. Stroux (1934) 317. On this use of πράττειν Stroux refers to the text of Aeschines *Against Timarchus* 74 τοὺς ὁμολογουμένως τὴν πρᾶξιν πράττοντας, 124 ὥστε σὺ πολλὰ πορνεῖα τῇ τῆς πράξεως εὐχερείᾳ πεποίηκας. μὴ οὖν ὅπου ποτὲ ἔπραττες, ἐρώτα, ἀλλ' ὡς οὐ πεποίηκας τοῦτο ἀπολογοῦ. The verb is used also of heterosexual acts: cf. Theocr. *Id.* 2. 143 ἐπράχθη τὰ μέγιστα, καὶ ἐς πόθον ἤνθομες ἄμφω.

117. Clayman (1980) 30, n.49.

118. Cf. Dawson (1950) 57, n. 24 on this line of the Diegesis "It is not, of course, impossible that the poet was able to use the phrase with a certain ambiguity."

summary deserve further comment: (1) the profession of schoolteacher and (2) the guise of well-wisher.

The *Suda* entry states that Callimachus was himself a schoolteacher: πρὶν δὲ cυcταθῆ τῷ βαcιλεῖ, γράμματα ἐδίδαcκεν ἐν Ἐλευcῖνι, κωμυδρίῳ τῆc Ἀλεξανδρίαc [prior to his presentation to the king he taught letters in Eleusis, a suburb of Alexandria] (Suda, s.v. Καλλίμαχοc 8–9). At one time this testimonium was accepted without question as biographical fact, but in recent years Callimachean scholarship has been divided on its possible factual value.[119] In addition to *Iambus* 5, several of Callimachus' other poems evoke the profession of schoolteacher, or allude to the world of the schoolroom; cf. *Iambus* 1.88 μαν]θάνοντεc οὐδ' ἄλφα, and *Ep.* 48 Pf. (26 G.-P.). *Iambus* 5, however, is, of Callimachus' extant works, the one most specifically concerned with a teacher of letters. Some scholars have suggested that *Iambus* 5 might in fact be the source from which the testimonium on Callimachus' schoolteaching period ultimately derived.[120] Certainly it has been traditionally assumed in the scholarship that this poem, given its subject matter, is addressed to one colleague by another,[121] and this assumption that the poetic voice is that of another schoolteacher may well have informed the biographical tradition. Scholarship on the ancient lives of the poets has demonstrated the dangers that lie in biographical detail originally derived from the poems;[122] while there may be somewhat more testimony for Callimachus' teaching career than for example, Sappho's,[123] it is still very suspect.

The diegete's note that the poet speaks ἐν ἤθει εὐνοίαc [in the guise of good intention] not only characterizes the figure of this poem's speaker, but is evocative of a larger feature of the *Iambi* as a whole, and,

119. Cameron (1995) 5–6 and 226 assumes the career as schoolteacher to be fiction, and at that pejorative fiction (cf. the parallels collected in his discussion), and further the line of the *Suda* to be an interpolation. D'Alessio (1996) 27 on the other hand is more inclined to accept the *Suda* testimonia as factual, with the wise caution that there is much room for ambiguity: "Si tratta naturalmente di un riscontro ambiguo, in quanto proprio da un interpretazione biografizzante di situazioni letterarie potrebbe derivare la notizia. D'altra parte non c'è in essa niente di inverosimile, e sarebbe immetodico voler svincolare del tutto l'esercizio letterario dal mondo cui allude." Cf. also Bulloch (1985) 549: "According to a tradition which we have no reason to disbelieve, Callimachus came to Alexandria first to work as a schoolmaster in the suburb of Eleusis. . . . "

120. See A. D. Booth, "Some Suspect Schoolmasters," *Florilegium* 3 (1981): 20.

121. So apparently Pfeiffer (1968) 125, n. 2, Dawson (1950) 57, n. 20 f.

122. See M. R. Lefkowitz (1976) 181–89, *The Lives of the Greek Poets,* (Baltimore, 1981), and, on Callimachus, "The Quarrel between Callimachus and Apollonius," *ZPE* 40 (1980): 1–18.

123. On Sappho see H. Parker, "Sappho Schoolmistress," *TAPA* 123 (1993): 309–51, reprinted in *Rereading Sappho: Reception and Transmission,* ed. E. Greene (Berkeley, 1996), 146–83.

indeed, of the poetry of Callimachus in general. This is a polychrome poetic voice, in one poem of the *Iambi* that of a Hipponactean figure, in others of speaking statues; so elsewhere of the dead poet Simonides, of a young girl's votive offering, or of a seeming participant in female religious cult. Hence in part lies the self-referential irony of *Iambus* 5.31–32 "I am your Bakis and your Sibyl, your laurel and your oak" from a poet so adept at manipulating and varying the traditional tool of archaic iambic—the *persona loquens*.

OPENING LINES

The structure of the poem is not easy to infer from the fragmentary remains. The whole appears to be a direct address to the unnamed figure, whom the poet apostrophizes in the opening line as ὦ ξεῖνε [O Friend]. Throughout the poem there is a continued interchange of first and second person singular; the speaker as well as the addressee are a constant presence. Indeed, there is a marked preponderance of first person references in lines 30 and following. There is possibly, as Pfeiffer suggests,[124] a transition in sense following line 22 ὣς δ' ἄν σε θωϊὴ λάβοι [so could punishment overtake you], and there appears to be another at line 30 with the exclamation ἆ, μή με ποιήσῃ γέ[λω [Ah, do not make me an object of laughter], and the introduction of prophetic images of lines 31–33. My discussion in the following pages assumes something of this overall structure mostly for the sake of convenience—the structure itself is again in large part a theoretical one.

The poem opens with a juxtaposition of two proverbial expressions that both evoke an atmosphere of what the diegete terms εὔνοια [good intention] and at the same time effect a contrast of the elevated (in the language and imagery of the proverbs) and the shameful (the conduct of the addressee). This is a quite different opening than that of Hippon. fr. 118 W. (129 Deg.). In that poem the speaker moves to direct attack, whereas here the real object of invective, the schoolteacher's conduct, is delayed at least for the opening lines (and quite possibly further). The *incipit* of the poem is a variation on a standard proverb[125] that appears in Plato (*Theages* 122b, *Ep.* 5.321c[126]) and in

124. To line 22 ὣς . . . λάβοι "seriem minarum, dissimulatarum sane (inde ab v. 7?) concludere videtur, deinde admonitiones (κοίμησον, ἴσχε etc.) sequuntur."

125. First preserved from Epicharmus, *PCG* 238 ἱερὸν ἡ συμβουλή ἐστιν "advice is a holy thing."

126. As Stroux (1934) 314 noted, in language strikingly like the opening of the *Iambus* 5: δίκαιος δ' εἰμὶ καὶ σοὶ ξενικὴν καὶ ἱερὰν συμβουλὴν λεγομένην συμβουλεύειν . . . [I am the right person to advise you with counsel spoken that is both friendly and sacred].

Lucian (*Rhet. praec.* 1). Both of these are passages concerned, as Dawson observes, specifically with young men and *paideia*.[127] Callimachus has inverted this trope at the opening of *Iambus* 5 in addressing advice not to the young man, but to the teacher, who is a source not of *paideia* but rather of misconduct. There is a further difference from the passages just cited where this proverb occurs. In those the name of the young man (Demodocus, Euphraeus), or an informal diminutive (μειράκιον) marks the relationship of speaker (the didactic figure) to youth; here the address ῏Ω ξεῖνε surprises us.

Following on a series of rather elevated rhetorical figures[128] culminating at line 3 ἐπεί ϲε δαίμων [since a spirit that you], the alphabet, ἄλφα βῆ̣τ̣ι[α, suddenly appears, evoking at once the contemporary (this is not a feature that would be found in archaic invective), and characterizing the addressee's most distinctive feature—he is a teacher of young children. There are further images of children in the extant poem at line 12 πά̣ϊϲ and perhaps (assuming this fragment to belong to *Iambus* 5) fr. 210 Pf. line 6 παιδ[. The alphabet also appears at *Iambus* 1.88 μαν]θ̣άνοντεϲ οὐδ' ἄλφα [knowing not even *alpha*] juxtaposed with a series of Hipponactean images of violence.

We know relatively little of the social position of schoolteachers in early Ptolemaic Egypt. In the reign of Ptolemy II Philadelphus they were exempt, along with athletic trainers (παιδοτρίβαι), from the salt-tax (*P. Hal.* 1.260–65),[129] but otherwise our information is scarce. It is, however, certainly the case that schoolteachers are frequently the objects of condescension, even scorn, in Hellenistic and later Greek literature. An epigram of Aratus (*A.P.* 11.437 = G.-P. 2) laments the fate of one Diotimus, portrayed as a teacher at Gargara:

αἰάζω Διότιμον, ὃς ἐν πέτραισι κάθηται
Γαργαρέων παισὶν βῆτα καὶ ἄλφα λέγων.

I cry "aiai" for Diotimus, who sits among the rocks
telling the abc's to the children of the Gargareans.

Several other ancient sources testify to the low social status of the schoolteacher. One is Lucian *Gall.* 23 ἢ Διονύσιος καταλυθεὶς τῆς τυραννίδος ἐν Κορίνθῳ γραμματιστὴς βλέπηται, μετὰ τηλικαύτην ἀρχὴν παιδία συλλαβίζειν διδάσκων [or Dionysius, deposed from the tyranny, is seen

127. Dawson (1950) 64.

128. For line 2 ἄκουε τἀπὸ καρδ̣ι[ίηϲ [hear that from my heart], cf. Eur. *IA* 475–76 ἦ μὴν ἐρεῖν ϲοι τἀπὸ καρδίαϲ ϲαφῶϲ, Aesch. *Choe.* 107 λέξω, κελεύειϲ γάρ, τὸν ἐκ φρενὸϲ λόγον.

129. See Maehler (1983) 196.

in Corinth as a schoolteacher, after so great an office, teaching children their abc's]. Indicative of the schoolteacher's social status is his appearance as a character in mime in Herodas 3.[130] Juvenal, *Sat.* 14. 208–9[131] *hoc monstrant vetulae pueris repentibus assae,* | *hoc discunt omnes ante alpha et beta puellae,* [aged nurses teach this to toddlers, all girls learn this before their abc's] is a passage worth noting here for the implicit parallel of nurse and schoolteacher.

Lines 10–13 appear to catalog a number of different occupations: a worker of the land, a woodcutter, perhaps a shepherd (line 12 ιμαινε̣ . πάϊc), and a merchant (line 13 ἐc θάλαccαν ἐμβαίνειν [to embark on the sea]. Dawson conjecturally reconstructs this passage to have essentially the sense, "your fate has decreed that you teach abc's, not the most advantageous (line 4 οὐχ ὡc ὀνήιcτον) pursuit, but better than these others."[132] This is a type of *sententia* common in Roman poetry, especially satire, and Dawson's reconstruction is a suggestive one.[133] Lines 4–5 clearly invoke something of a contrast, which would fit well with this reading.

The broken opening lines of *Iambus* 5 alternate between first and second person presence, admonition from the speaker and action and possible suffering (lines 17 ἀλγέων̣ μηδὲ γούνατα κλ̣ί̣ν̣ω̣ν̣, perhaps 20 κεραυνώcη, 22 ὣc ϳ δ' ἄν cε θωϊὴ λάβοι, [so could punishment overtake you]). The last phrase was attributed in antiquity to Archilochus (fr. 329 W.). If this is indeed an archaic citation, not simply an error in attribution, this would be the only known full line citation in the *Iambi.*[134] The poem, with its admonitory voice and manner of reasoned exhortation, has, as several scholars have noted, a particularly Archilochean quality; D'Alessio[135] well points to the use of the oracular voice in Archilochus fr. 25.5 W. τοῦτ' οὔτις ἄλλ]ος μάντις ἀλλ' ἐγὼ εἶπέ σοι [but this no other seer told you but I], and in *Adesp. Iamb.* fr. 35.14 W., an iambic fragment of unknown authorship but possibly of Archilochus, ταῦτ' [ἐ]γὼ μαντεύο̣[μαι [this I prophesy]. The latter fragment is a further archaic poem that foretells punishment for ethical misdeeds. The debt that the *Iambi* owe Archilochus in terms of language, imagery, and theme is even less easily ascertainable than the relationship of these poems to Hipponax, and one that clearly deserves further study. Certainly the poetic voice cast as that of ethical σύμβουλος

130. See Headlam-Knox pp. 133–34, cf. Cameron (1955) 5–7.
131. Deleted by Jahn, see Courtney on these lines.
132. Dawson (1950) 57.
133. Cf. D'Alessio (1996) 615, n. 96.
134. See, however, my comments on *Iambus* 1.1.
135. D' Alessio (1996) 615, n. 97.

[advisor] is a signal feature of Archilochus, especially in his epodic fragments.

IMAGERY POETIC AND ORACULAR

Lines 23–29 encompass two admonitions to the poem's addressee to restrain his passion. These were cited by Choeroboscus[136] and by Gregory of Corinth[137] as examples of ἀλληγορία, which both sources mean as veiled language used to imply what cannot be stated openly because of a sense of shame (αἰcχύνη, αἰδώc) or discretion (εὐλάβεια). These remarks of two writers, one from late antiquity, one from the Byzantine period, are often included in discussions of Callimachus' handling of his subject material in this poem. Here I would suggest caution in interpreting these lines. Callimachus himself is using standard erotic metaphors, each with particular effect, and indeed each with enigmatic character—this prepares the poem's audience in part for the image of the poet as oracular voice at lines 31–34. In neither case should we necessarily attribute to him the need a later period felt for euphemism.

The images are both standard metaphors of erotic passion. The second (lines 26–29) combines two images from the *Iliad,* 5.586 κύμβαχος ἐν κονίῃσιν ἐπὶ βρεχμόν τε καὶ ὤμους [headlong in the dust to his neck and shoulders] and 16.749 ὡς νῦν ἐν πεδίῳ ἐξ ἵππων ῥεῖα κυβιστᾷ [as he easily somersaults now to the ground from his horses], while evoking a third, Nestor's advice to his son at 23.327 ff. This may be a deliberate evocation of Homeric texts used in schools—the schoolteacher is admonished in his own terms. D'Alessio[138] suggests that the first image (25–26) alludes to Alcaeus fr. 74.6 ff. V., where the scholion reads: ἀλλὰ ὦ Μυτιληναῖοι ἔωc ἔτι καπνὸν μόνο[ν] ἀφίηcι τὸ ξύλον, τοῦτ' ἔcτιν ἕως οὐδέπω τυραννη[εύει], κατάcβετε καὶ καταπαύcατε ταχέωc μὴ λα[μπρό]τερον τὸ φῶc γένηται [but, men of Mytilene, while the wood yet gives off nothing but smoke—that is to say, while he is not yet

136. Choeroboscus Περὶ τρόπων ποιητικῶν, Spengel *Rh. Gr.* III 245, 6 ἀλληγορία . . . δι' εὐλάβειαν . . . ὡς καὶ παρὰ Καλλιμάχῳ 'τὸ πῦρ δέ τ' ἀνέκαυσας ἕως οὗ πολλῇ κεχώρηκε φλογί' καὶ πάλιν 'ἴcχε δὲ δρόμου μαργῶντας ἵππους, μὴ δευτέραν κάμψῃς, μήτι παρὰ νύccῃ δίφρον ἄξωcιν, ἐκ δὲ κύμβαχος κυβιστήcῃc'. ταῦτα οὐ κυρίως εἴρηται· οὔτε γὰρ περὶ πυρὸς οὔτε περὶ ἱπποδρομίας ὁ λόγος αὐτῷ, ἀλλ' ὥcπερ αἰδούμενος εἰπεῖν ὃ ἐβούλετο τῇ ἀλληγορίᾳ ἐχρήcατο.

137. Gregory of Corinth Περὶ τρόπων, Spengel *Rh. Gr.* III 216, 3 ἀλληγορία . . . δι' εὐλαβείαν ἢ δι' αἰcχύνην . . . ὃν τρόπον παρὰ Καλλιμάχῳ ἐν Ἰάμβοις· 'τὸ πῦρ ὅπερ ἀνέκαυσας πολλὴν πρόσω κέχρηκε φλόγα· ἴσχε δὲ δρόμον μαργοῦντας ἵππους' ταῦτα κτλ.- αἰδούμενος ἐκδηλοῦν ἤλεγξε τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τῆc θρασύτητος.

138. D'Alessio (1996) 617, n. 99. On this fragment of Alcaeus, see D. L. Page, *Sappho and Alcaeus* (Oxford, 1955), 237–38.

tyrant—extinguish it, suppress it quickly, lest it blaze into brighter flame]. The cumulative effect of poetic recall here is at once to place the blame poem on a different level and to showcase the poet's allusive facility—the poem of *psogos* becomes a vehicle for recasting archaic admonitory utterance.

At line 30 ἆ, μή με ποιήcῃ γέ[λω [Ah, do not make me an object of laughter], the speaker's identity is unclear. Either the poet exclaims, or, perhaps more likely, ascribes the reaction of the addressee in the manner of the Roman satirists.[139] The fragmentary lines that follow line 34 appear to contain a continual interchange of first and second person, of speaking voice and addressee. Altered voice is also the predominant effect of the speaker's assumption of variegated oracular tones at lines 31–33:

ἐγὼ Βάκιc τοι καὶ Cίβυλλα [καὶ] δάφνη
καὶ φηγόc. ἀλλὰ cυμβαλεῦ
τᾧνιγμα, καὶ μὴ Πιτθέωc ἔχε χρείην·

I am your Bakis and your Sibyl and your laurel
and your oak. But interpret
this riddle, and have no need of Pittheus.

The speaking voice is itself a riddle, an amalgamation of oracular voices. The admonishing voice becomes a catalogue of famous Greek oracular sites, Boeotia and Cumae, Delphi and Dodona. The poem's speaker chides the errant schoolteacher in cumulative terms that, as the poetic allusions at lines 23–29, memorialize earlier cultural features in the setting of chiding iambic verses. As *Iambus* 3, *Iambus* 5 criticizes as an act of iambic invective and cultural memory.

139. See D'Alessio (1996) 617, n. 101.

SIX

The Statues

Iambi 6, 7, and 9

Three of Callimachus' *Iambi* take their point of departure from works of plastic art, works that are in turn given life, and indeed viewed through the poet's verses. Each of these statuary poems may be characterized on its own and apart from the others, whether from aspects of generic type, setting, voice of speaker, level of poetic or other model. *Iambus* 6 is an extended description by the knowledgeable poet in Alexandria of Pheidias' chryselephantine statue of Zeus at Olympia told to a man traveling to view the statue. *Iambus* 7 is an aretalogy spoken by a statue of Hermes at Ainos in Thrace, which tells of the statue's journey by sea from the Troad, and the establishment of his cult in Ainos. And *Iambus* 9 is a dialogue between an *erastes* and an ithyphallic statue of Hermes at a small wrestling school; the Diegesis to this poem states that the statue of Hermes related his Tyrrhenian origin.[1] At the same time the three poems might well be termed variations on the same compositional line. All are representations of cult figures. All are concerned with cult statues of origin far from Alexandria. Each is an extension of a poetic trope, the *ecphrasis,* the speaking votive object, the *aition,* and each is in its own way a play on that trope. The *ecphrasis* is detailed by the learned poet to the would-be viewer, the votive object's declaration evolves into extended autobiographical narrative, the erotic etiological question turns into erotic condemnation. Further, all are variations of the didactic, each imparting information about itself to a viewer specified or not.

The statues of the *Iambi* have long been seen as remarkable as individual examples of innovative art form. No interpretive study of these

1. Although the geographical setting of *Iambus* 9 is alluded to neither in the extant lines nor in the Diegesis, it is nonetheless reasonable to assume that the mention of Tyrrhenian origin evokes an aspect of distance between the image's origin and its present setting. Thus all three poems have as a central feature distance, even displacement.

poems has hitherto treated them as a group, read them for possible points of contact to and variation from one another, nor considered their place in the *Iambi* as a whole. The object of this chapter is precisely such an evaluation, one that brings together three readings of sculpted figures in the, admittedly at first surprising, medium of iambic verses.

It has become customary in the scholarship on the *Iambi* to emphasize the increasingly experimental quality of the later poems of the collection. This line of discussion is worth reviewing, and can, I think, be enriched by some additional points of similarity drawn among the later poems. *Iambi* 1–5, although poems of different tone, structure, and model, may all be termed invective. All direct censure at persons specified or understood, and all are in some aspect condemnatory. *Iambi* 1–4 are composed in stichic choliambics, the metrical form most characteristic of Hipponax, and which in the Hellenistic period in and of itself evokes the image of the earlier poet. *Iambus* 5 is an epode composed in alternating choliambs and iambic dimeter; we know that Hipponax also composed epodic verse.[2] Callimachus composes the first five poems in the same dialect, a literary Ionic. With *Iambus* 13 Callimachus returns to the meter, dialect, and the invective nature of the earlier poems.[3] *Iambi* 6–12 are composed in a variety of meters, with some variety of dialect (6, 9, and 11 are in a literary Doric, 7 has some Aeolic elements). Several of the later *Iambi* (8, 9, 10, and 11) are etiological; two (8 and 12) are occasional, or deploy the fiction of occasion.

There are other aspects that differentiate the later poems and that have largely escaped the notice of their interpreters. First of all the setting of the first five poems is apparently Callimachus' contemporary Alexandria. In the case of *Iambus* 1 this is explicitly stated, and affirmed by the diegete. *Iambi* 2–5 do not specify a setting, at least in the texts as we have them. Nonetheless, for two reasons I think this a sound inference. (1) All four poems involve a close interaction of poet and figures of his acquaintance, or presented as those of his acquaintance, whether addressees or others who appear in these verses: the voiced figures of *Iambus* 2, Euthydemus in *Iambus* 3, the figures of the disagreement in *Iambus* 4. (2) While other geographic references occur

2. Hippon. frr. 115–18 W. (129–31 Deg.). The archaic iambic poet whom scholars most frequently associate with the epode is Archilochus, and *Iambus* 5 exhibits many Archilochean touches (I discuss some of these in my treatment of *Iambus* 5 in the previous chapter).

3. This return to the meter, dialect, and themes of the earlier poems is in and of itself the strongest argument for *Iambus* 13 as a poem of closure. The problem of the number of the *Iambi* and the four poems which follow *Iambus* 13 in the Diegesis I discuss in the introduction.

in these poems, they have no other geographic setting. *Iambi* 1–5 all in some sense evoke Callimachus' contemporary Alexandria. In the later *Iambi* the setting is much more varied. The statue of Zeus at Olympia, the statue of Hermes at Ainos in Thrace, an epinician for Polycles of Aegina, a cult of Aphrodite at Aspendus in Pamphylia, a brothel-keeper at Selinus in Sicily all foreground distant geographic settings. E. Courtney has suggested to me that the prominence of Crete in *Iambus* 12 probably signifies that the island is the birthplace of the little girl celebrated in the poem. *Iambus* 12 would then be another poem of distanced setting. There is a marked emphasis in the later poems on journeys,[4] and on displacement and reintegration. The addressee of *Iambus* 6, the statue of *Iambus* 7, the settling of Connidas in Sicily in *Iambus* 11 all evoke, in different ways, themes of dislocation and resettlement. The narrative voice also shows considerable variation. *Iambus* 7 is spoken by the statue of Hermes, *Iambus* 11 by the dead Connidas from his tomb. *Iambus* 9 is in dialogue form between statue and viewer. Gods and their manifestations figure very prominently in these later poems, in representation of cult, divine paradigm, or statue.

4. In a sense the emphasis on journeys returns to a theme of *Iambus* 1, which is then reinvoked in *Iambus* 13, in the first the journey of Hipponax from Hades, in the last the journey to Ephesus. On the themes of mobility and displacement in Hellenistic poetry of this period see J. Burton, *Theocritus's Urban Mimes: Mobility, Gender, and Patronage* (Berkeley, 1995), 7–40 and Selden (1998) 307–19.

ʾAλεῖος ὁ Ζεύς, ἁ τέχνα δὲ Φειδία
. . ωχ̣. . . [
η. [.]. . . το. [
. . [
. . [
αυτ[
αν. . [
τ̣ῶ. [
ουκ[
. α. . [̣].̂. . ̓[
. ανδ̣ιφ. . . . [
Πῖς̣αν ω. . . [
π̣αχ .̣. τιμ[
εκδε̣ . . [
. . [

[lines 16–21 have traces of the first letter of some lines]

. ς λαγὸς χελύναν,
κ̣αὶ τὠπίβαθρον τῶ θρόν[ω] τ̣ὸ̣ χρύ[ςι]ο̣ν
.]. εν ἐπλάτυνται.
. .]. δ [.]ε̣ιρὰν πέντε τ̣ε̣[τ]ρ[άκι]ν̣ [πο]δῶν̣
. . .]τ[.]δ’ ἐς ἰθύ,
. . .]. . τετράδωρα ταν[ ]. [
. . . .]αι παλαςταί.
.]Λ̣υδιεργὲς δ’ὦ̃ ’πι θῴγιον β̣ρ̣[έ]τ̣α̣[ς
. .]άνω κάθηται
. .]ι̣ μὲν τρὶς ἐς τὸ μακρὸν ιδ̣[.] .[. . .] δέκα
] ἴκατιν δ’ἐς εὖρος
. . . . .]υ̣ν[. . . . .]ες[. . .]μ̣[
. . . . . .]δετοιμ[
. . . .]. ακ[. .]τ̣α̣ῖος ε[.]. ίκοιτ[̓]. . [
.]αχυ. . κ’ ἐλο̣. [.]. ς.

Text: *PSI* 1216 preserves lines 1–21, *P. Oxy.* 2171 frr. 2 and 3 lines 22–49 and 58–62 respectively.

Meter: alternating iambic trimeters and ithyphallics.

Dialect: literary Doric.

11 .ανδ̣ιφ. . . .[Pfeiffer suggests δ̣ιφθ̣ε̣ρ̣α̣[, the leather pouch carried by travelers.

The Zeus is of Elis, the skill of Pheidias
. . ωχ̣ ̀. . . [
η. [.]. . . το. [
. . [
. . [
αυτ[
αν. . [
τ̣ω̂. [
ουκ[
. α. . [̣].̂. . ̓[
. ανδ̣ιφ. . . . [
Pisa ω. . . [
π̣αχ.̀ .τιμ[
εκδ̣ε. . [
. . [

[lines 16–21 have traces of the first letter of some lines]

[until] hare tortoise,
and the gold base of the throne
.]. εν are extended.
. .]. δ[.]ε̣ιρὰν four times five feet
. . .]τ[.] and in length,
. . .]. . four palms long ταν[ ]. [
. . . .]αι palms.
.] of Lydian workmanship upon which the holy image
. .]άνω sits
. .]ι̣ in height three times ιδ̣[.] .[. . .] ten
] in breadth twenty
. . . . .]υ̣ν[. . . . .]εc[. . .]μ̣[
. . . . . .]δετοιμ[
. . . .]. ακ[. .]τ̣α̣ῖοc ε[.]. ίκοιτ[́]. . [
.]αχυ. . κ’ ἐλο̣. [.]. c.

12 Πῖς̣αν Pfeiffer to this line, “2 sqq. prior pars iambi ad iter γνωρίμου spectare videtur.” This may, however, be another way of referring to the statue itself; cf. Schol. (BDEQ) Pind. *O.* 10.55 c. τὸν ἐν Πίcῃ δὲ Δία Ἠλεῖον εἶπε Καλλίμαχοc (the scholiast then cites the opening of the line Ἀλεῖοc ὁ Ζεύc).
22 .c Pfeiffer app. crit. 22: vix ὡc (L.), fort. ἕ̂c=ἕωc ? Pf.

αὐτὸc δ’ ὁ δαίμων πέντ[ε] τ[ᾶ]c ἐφεδρ[ί]δοc
παχέεccι μάccων·
.]ι̣τ̣ε̣ῖ̣ δὲ Νίκα χη. ε̣ δὶc δυ. [ʽ
. . . .]. [.]ει̣ τελει. . [
. . . .]η. εκηπ[ʹ .] . . [.]αταιδ[
παρθένοι γὰρ ʾΩραι
τᾶν ὀργυιαιᾶν ὅccον οὐδὲ πάc̣[cα]λ̣ο̣[ν
φαντὶ μειονεκτεῖν.
τ[ὸ] δ’ ὧν ἀναιcίμωμα—λίχνοc ἐccὶ [γάρ
καὶ τό μευ πυθέcθαι—
. . . .]ˆ [.] . μὲν [ο]ὐ [λ]ογιcτὸν οὐδ . [.]ε[
. . . . .]ἔc τε χρυcό[ν
. . . . .] ̀[. . . .]. [. .] ́[

[lines 50–57 are missing]

58]
]ω̣θεδηc’ ὁ Φει̣δ̣[ίαc
]’Αθανα̣[
]. [.]. [. .]. δ’ ὁ Φειδία πατ[ήρ.
. . . . .] ἀπέρχε̣υ.

Diegesis to *Iambus* 6

VII

’Αλεῖοc ὁ Ζεύc, ἃ τέχνα δὲ Φειδία Γνω-
ρίμῳ αὐτοῦ ἀποπλέοντι κατὰ θέαν
τοῦ ’Ολυμπίου Διὸc εἰc ʾΗλιν διηγεῖται
μῆκοc ὕψοc πλάτοc βάcεωc θρόνου
ὑποποδίου αὐτοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ὅcη ἡ
δαπάνη, δημιουργὸν δὲ Φειδίαν Χαρμί-
δου ’Αθηναῖον.

43 My translation follows Pfeiffer’s in “The Measurements of the Zeus at Olympia,” *JHS* 61 (1941): 1–5 (reprinted in Pfeiffer [1960] 72–79). Cf. D’Alessio’s (1996) 623 rendition “dicon che di quelle, alte un braccio, neanche un pochino sono più basse.”

and the god himself is taller than the throne
by five cubits.
.]ιτεῖ and Victory χη. ε twice δυ. [`
. . . .]. [.]ει τελει. . [
. . . .]η. εκηπ[΄ .] . . [.]αταιδ[
For the virgin Seasons say
they do not fall short of the women who are one fathom
high by so much as a peg.
And as to the expense of these—for you are greedy
to learn this too of me—
. . . .] ˆ [.]. not to be reckoned not even . [.]ε[
. . . . .] and as to gold
. . . . .] ` [. . . .]. [. .] ΄[

[lines 50–57 are missing]

]
]ωθεδηc' Pheidias
]Athen-[
]. [.]. [. .]. and the father of Pheidias.
. . . . .] go on forth.

"The Zeus is of Elis, but the craft of Pheidias"
To an acquaintance of his sailing off to Elis
to see the sight of Olympian Zeus, he narrates
the length, height, and breadth of the base, the throne,
the footstool, and of the god himself, and how much
was the expense, and that the creator was the Athenian
Pheidias the son of Charmides.

Iambus 7 (fr. 197 Pf.)

ʽΕρμᾶc ὁ Πιερφεραῖοc, Αἰνίων θεόc,
ἔμμι τῶ φιυγαίχμα
. . . . .] πάρεργον ἱπποτέκτον[οc·
. . . . .] γὰρ [ὠ]νήρ
. . . . . c]κέπαρνον αιδ.[
]. πται·
]οί βα[.]. ά. . . . [
]. . [
] [
] [
]. ἦντο κἀποτη. [
]. μα. . τα· [
]ο Cκάμα[ν]ιδροc ἀγριωμένοc
]ξαέρραc
]ν κατὰ ρόον
]
]ι με δικτύοιc
]
]ον, ὦ Παλαίμονεc
. . . .]
.[ ]το θηρίον·
ο[ ]
[ ]ον, ὦ Παλαίμονεc
ω[ ]
ο[ ] ἄπωθε τὸν φθόρον
. . . .

Text: The fragments of *Iambus* 7 are preserved by two papyri, *P. Oxy.* 2171 fr. 3 contains lines 1–14, *P. Oxy.* 661 lines 11–25 and 39–51.

Meter: epodic, alternating iambic trimeters and ithyphallics.

Dialect: literary Doric with some Aeolic elements.

14 Pf. app. crit. αέρ **P,** fort. ἐ]ξαέρραc.

25 ἄπωθε τὸν φθόρον For φθόρος Pfeiffer suggests the sense ἐπὶ τοῦ μηδενὸς ἀξίου [accounted of no worth] (Poll. 5.162) and cites two parallels from Aristophanes. Cf. Prop. 4.2.59–60 *stipes acernus eram, properanti falce dolatus | ante Numam grata pauper in urbe deus* [I was a trunk of maple wood, hewn by a hastening axe, before Numa, I, a poor god in a thankful city].

I am Hermes Perpheraios, god of the Aineans,
a by-work of the coward
. . . . . .] builder of the horse
. . . . . .] for the man
. . . . .] an adze αιδ. [
]. πταιˑ
]οἰ βᾳ[.]. ά. . . . [
]. . [
] [
] [
]. ἦντο κἀποτη. [
]. μα. . τα· [
]ο the furious Scamander
] raised up
]ν downstream
]
]ι me with nets
]
]ον, O gods of the sea
. . . .]
. [ ] monster
ο[ ]
[ ]ον, O gods of the sea
ω[ ]
ο̂ [ ] throw away the piece of rubbish
. . . .

[lines 26–38 are missing]

. . . .
ποτ' ἀcτέραc βλ[επ
καὶ τύχαμπυριξ. [
ἔληγ' ὁ μῦθοc· κα[
πυρδάνω 'πὺ λεπ[τῶ·
κἠγὼ 'π' ἐκείναν [
ταῖc ἐμαῖc ἐπῳδα[ῖc·
οἱ δ' εἶπαν [. . .]νε[
μὴ τύ γ' αὖτιc ἔνθ[ηc.'
ἦ, καί με πόντον [
ἦνθε cαυνιαcτά[c.
ἔρριψαν, αὖθι δ' ἐξ ἁλὸ[c
π[.]ρβαλον κατάγρ[
ἐ[κ] τᾶc θαλάccαc τ[

39–40 My translation follows E. A. Barber's conjectures (1955) 242 for lines 39–40:

ποτ' ἀcτέραc βλ[έποντα
καὶ τύχαι ἐμπυρίξω

The sense of line 40 is then καὶ τύχαι (sc. ἀγαθᾶι) ἐμπυρίξω, [and with good fortune I will set you on fire].

41 ἔληγ' ὁ μῦθοc Cf. fr. 43.84 ὧ[c] ἡ μὲν λίπε μῦθον. These lines are problematic; the reading I have given is that suggested by Barber (1955) 242. The papyrus has ἑληγ' and oc·.

50 For this line some conjectures include π[ά]ρβαλον Gr.-H.[they take alongside] and κατ' ἄγρ[ην Powell [with the catch]; e.g. perhaps "they took me up with the catch," or something similar.

[lines 26–38 are missing]

. . . .

looking] upon the stars[
40 and with good fortune [I will set you on fire]
his speech ended, κα[
from a slender brand[
And I against that[
with my incantations[.
45 And they said [. . .]ν̣ε̣[
don't you come back."[
He spoke(?), and me into the sea[
a fisherman with a spear came.[
they cast me, but again from the sea[
50 π̣[.]ρβ̣αλον κατάγρ[
out of the sea τ[

Diegesis to *Iambus* 7

VII

32 Ἑρμᾶc ὁ Περφεραῖοc Αἰνίων θεόc
Περφεραῖοc Ἑρμῆc ἐν Αἴνῳ τῇ
πόλει τῆc Θρᾴκηc τιμᾶται ἐντεῦ-

VIII

θεν· Ἐπειὸc πρὸ τοῦ δουρείου ἵππου ἐδημι-
ούργηcεν Ἑρμᾶν, ὃν ὁ Cκάμανδροc πολὺc
ἐνεχθεὶc κατέcυρεν· ὁ δ' ἐντεῦθεν προcη-
νέχθη εἰc τὴν πρὸc Αἴνῳ θάλαccαν, ἀφ' ἧc
ἁλιευόμενοί τινεc ἀνείλκυcαν αὐτὸν τῇ
cαγήνῃ. ὅτε ἐθεάcαντο αὐτόν, καταμεμψά-
μενοι τὸν βόλον πρὸc ἀλέαν cχίζειν τε αὐ-
τὸν καὶ παρακαίειν αὐτοῖc ἐπεχείρουν,
οὐδὲν δὲ ἧττον (?) ἔφθαcαν ἢ τὸν ὦμον παί-
cαντεc τραύματοc τύπον ἐργάcαcθαι, διαμ-
περὲc δὲ ἠcθένηcαν· καὶ ὅλον αὐτὸν καίειν
ἐπεχείρουν, τὸ δὲ πῦρ αὐτῷ περιέρρει· ἀπει-
πόντεc κατέρριψαν αὐτὸν εἰc τὴν θάλαc-
cαν. ἐπεὶ δὲ αὖτιc ἐδικτυούλκηcαν, θεὸν νο-
μίcαντεc εἶναι ἢ θεῷ προcήκοντα κα-
θιδρύcαντο ἐπὶ τοῦ αἰγιαλοῦ ἱερὸν αὐτοῦ,
ἀπήρξαντό τε τῆc ἄγραc ἄλλοc παρ' ἄλλου
αὐτὸν πε[ριφέρω]ν. τοῦ δὲ Ἀπόλλωνοc χρή-
cαντοc εἰ[cεδέξαν]το τῇ πόλει καὶ [π]αρα-
πληcίωc τ[οῖc θεοῖc] ἐτίμων.

9 R. Herzog (cit. by Pfeiffer) deleted ἧττον.

18 Suppl. R. Herzog (cit. by Pfeiffer). The conjecture is paralleled by the description of the image of Dionysus Phallen in Methymna *IG* XII 2.503.10 τᾶc τοῦ ἀγάλ-
ματοc περιφορᾶc [of the carrying round of the image] cited by Pfeiffer.

VII

32 "Hermes Perpheraios, god of the Aineans"
Hermes Perpheraios is honored in Ainos, the city
in Thrace, for this reason.

VIII

1 Epeius, before the wooden horse, fashioned
a statue of Hermes that swollen Scamander
bearing off swept away. Thence it was borne
to the sea by Ainos, where some men fishing
5 drew it up in their net. When they saw it, finding fault
with their catch, they tried to cut it up for firewood
and to make a fire for themselves,
but on striking it they were able to do no more(?)
than make a wound-like mark upon the shoulder,
10 before they were completely worn out.
And they tried to burn it whole,
but the fire flowed around it.
Giving up they cast it back down into the sea.
But when they caught it up again in their nets, believing
15 it to be a god or connected with a god,
they established a shrine to it there upon the beach,
and offered the first fruits of their catch
one handing it round from another.
When Apollo gave a response they received it into the city
20 and honored it very much like the gods.

Iambus 9 (fr. 199 Pf.)

Ἑρμᾶ, τί τοι τὸ γ̣ιεῦρον, ὦ Γενειόλα,
ποττὰν ὑπήναν κοὐ ποτ᾽ ἴχνι̣[ον ;

Diegesis to *Iambus* 9

VIII

Ἑρμᾶ τί τοι τὸ νεῦρον ὦ Γενειόλα Φιλη-
τάδου παιδὸc εὐπρεποῦc ἐραcτὴc ἰδὼν
Ἑρμοῦ ἄγαλμα ἐν παλαιcτριδίῳ ἐντε-
ταμένον, πυνθάνεται μὴ διὰ τὸν Φιλη-
τάδαν. ὁ δέ φηcιν ἄνωθεν εἶναι Τυρcη-
νὸc καὶ κατὰ μυcτικὸν λόγον ἐντε-
τάcθαι, ἐπὶ κακῷ δὲ αὐτὸν φιλεῖν τὸν
Φιλητάδαν

Text: Only these two lines of this *Iambus* have survived; three if we ascribe fr. 221 Pf. αἰτοῦμεν εὐμάθειαν Ἑρμᾶνοc δόcιν to *Iambus* 9. The two lines are preserved in a papyrus fragment of a commentary to Nicander's *Theriaca* (*P. Oxy.* 2221 col. ii lines 5–6); the first line is supplemented by the lemma of the Diegesis.

Meter: iambic trimeter.

Dialect: literary Doric.

2 Pf. app. crit. fort. βλέπει Maas vel ποτ᾽ ἴχνι̣[α ῥέπει.

Hermes, O bearded one, why does your prick
to your beard and not to your feet . . . ?

VIII

"Hermes, O bearded one, why does your prick"
A lover of a handsome boy, Philetades, on seeing
a statue of Hermes with an erection in a small wrestling school,
asks him whether this is not on account of Philetades.
And he says that he is of Tyrrhenian origin far back
and is erect according to a story revealed in mysteries,
and further that he loves Philetades
to bad purpose.

Interpretation

In considering the prominent place of statuary in Callimachus' *Iambi* and the use of a verse medium usually perceived as "low" for the representation of cult works of art, there are, I believe, two directions of inquiry that are especially helpful to follow. The first is to review the place of aesthetic criticism in earlier iambic poetry, to consider carefully in the fragments of Archilochus and Hipponax the instances that contain aesthetic descriptions, and to evaluate these as possible models or influences for Callimachus. For in reading the extended descriptions of statuary in Callimachus' iambic verse, descriptions that themselves veer so strikingly from the nature of the earlier poems in the collection, an obvious question arises. To what extent is the Alexandrian poet following an archaic iambic tradition, or to what extent is he in fact redefining the genre? or both? The second direction of inquiry I will follow is to consider the appearance and significance of statuary and other works of art elsewhere in the poetry of Callimachus. In several genres (hymn, epigram, *aitia,* and *iamboi*) cult statues and ἀναθήματα, particularly those at some geographic remove, are the subjects of the poet's interest. As Callimachus' poetry tries in other aspects to capture, to redefine the temporally and spatially distant, so too with cult statues Callimachus represents a panorama of distant art works for his Alexandrian audience.

Archilochus, Hipponax, and the Language and Imagery of the Aesthetic

Artistic representation, whether *ecphrasis* (the description of an object) or the simple evocation of a known image, is a feature of a number of Greek poetic genres (including epic and monody) from an early period. However, the fragments of archaic iambic poetry are not an immediately obvious area to look for models for extended artistic description, primarily for two reasons. First of all, descriptive language, apart from some erotic contexts where the figure viewed might be said to be delineated in terms of a positive aesthetic,[5] is for the most part a feature of negative portrayal of individuals, for mockery or vilification. Objects that are described in archaic iambic are generally simple, "low"

5. As in some of the fragments of Archilochus describing the daughters of Lycambes, e.g. Archil. fr. 48.5–6 W.

τροφὸς κατ.[ιἐσμυριχμένας κόμην
καὶ στῆθος, ιώς ἂν καὶ γέρων ἠράσσατο.

objects, a pail, a fig, and the lack of descriptive embellishment is itself a mark of their humble nature.[6] The fragments of Hipponax feature a remarkable number of such objects. And it is again his poetry that provides some suggestive parallels for Callimachus' poems of statues. I have discussed Hipponax and the aesthetic criticism in his poetry in an earlier chapter. I suggested there that Callimachus had in Hipponax, whom he evokes so deliberately in the opening and closing poems of his collection, a model of a choliambic poet voicing aesthetic criticism. Further, I suggested that Callimachus, in his assessment of the concerns of contemporary poetic discourse, had evoked this figure as a mark of valorization of his own critical voice and as a demonstration of *variatio*. He transferred the spirit of Hipponactean criticism to another time and other issues. Here in considering the prominence of the statues of Callimachus' *Iambi,* we return to the earlier poet and some of the same fragments.

The testimonia to the life of Hipponax assert that Bupalus and Athenis, the recipients of much of the poet's barbed verse, were sculptors, and that their sculpted representation of the poet was in fact the impetus for his iambic attacks.[7] However, none of the extant fragments in which Bupalus appears mention this sculpture. One surviving fragment of Hipponax that is an example of extended aesthetic description is fr. 28 W. (39 Deg.), the poet's attack on a trireme painter named Mimnes.[8]

Their nurse brought them, their hair
and breasts anointed with perfume,
such that even an old man would have longed for them.

Cf. Archil. frr. 30, 31 W.

ἔχουσα θαλλὸν μυρσίνης ἐτέρπετο
ῥοδῆς τε καλὸν ἄνθος.

ἡ δέ οἱ κόμη
ὤμους κατεσκίαζε καὶ μετάφρενα.

With a sprig of myrtle she was playing
and the fair blossom of a rose.

and her hair
overshadowed her shoulders and back.

The descriptive quality of Archil. fr. 122 (on the eclipse of 648 B.C.E.) is also worth bearing in mind here.

6. Whereas in some Hellenistic poetry the elaborate description of humble objects is a deliberate variation on earlier traditions of grand and humble. The scanty food of the poor widow Hecale has a very different role in its setting than the scanty food of the poor in the fragments of Hipponax.

7. The testimonia on Bupalus and Athenis I discuss in some detail in ch. 1 pp. 32–33. See also my article (1996) 205–16.

8. I discuss Hipponax fr. 28 W. (39 Deg.) in detail in ch. 1, pp. 34–35.

The fragment is, of course, mostly an invective shaft directed at the unfortunate Mimnes, but it is also descriptive. Encapsulated in the language of abuse is a description of the outer wall of the trireme with its wrongly directed serpent. The speaker's gaze follows the snake meandering from one end of the boat to the other.

Another fragment of Hipponax suggestive in this context is fr. 42 W. (7 Deg.) which details several of the monuments of Lydia.

†τέαρε[.....]δεύειε† τὴν ἐπὶ Σμύρνης
ἰθὺ διὰ Λυδῶν παρὰ τὸν Ἀττάλεω τύμβον
καὶ σῆμα Γύγεω καὶ [Σεσώ]στρ[ιος] στήλην
καὶ μνῆμα Τωτος Μυτάλιδι πάλμυδος,
πρὸς ἥλιον δύνοντα γαστέρα τρέψας.

†τέαρε[.....]δεύειε† the road to Smyrna
straight through the Lydians by the tomb of Attalus
and the monument of Gyges and the stele of Sesostris
and the memorial of Tos, potentate of Mytalis,
after turning your belly to the setting sun.

Like the Mimnes fragment, this is a short citation,[9] the language comparatively direct and unadorned. Nonetheless, the passage is remarkable as an example of Hipponax' verse that (1) has a journey as its theme and (2) catalogues several monuments.

The Mimnes fragment suggests that Callimachus had in Hipponax a model in the description of an object of artistic skill. The journey to Smyrna associates the earlier iambic poet with remarkable known monuments, and so in a different way prefigures Callimachus. Callimachus' relationship to the earlier poet throughout the *Iambi* is a complex and evolving one, and his three statuary poems incorporate, indeed elaborate on, elements of other genres, and other authors and types of author. Callimachus did, however, have in Hipponax a model for certain types of descriptive iambic verse, and we should keep this in mind in evaluating the place of the statuary poems in the collection.

There is another association of the archaic iambic poets and physical monuments in the Hellenistic period, and this is rather a contemporary one. This is the commemorative monuments established in honor of archaic poets, such as the *Archilocheion* on Paros and the *Homereion* in Alexandria, and also the literature that reflects and plays with these instantiations, the epigrams that declare themselves the tombs

9. Cited by Tzetzes, περὶ μέτρων, *An. Gr.* p. 310 Cramer, in his treatment of Hipponax' choliambs.

of poets. P. Bing has well called this phenomenon in cult and in literature the "memorializing impulse,"[10] and indeed this term could well be said to categorize the statuary poems of the *Iambi*. The *Archilocheion* depicts the hero Archilochus[11] with shield and lyre. Archilochus here is both the poet and his physical representation; the figures both call the viewer to a past and present image (poetry and marble relief). An epigram such as [Theocritus] 21 (14 G.-P.) is especially evocative of this dual nature:

Ἀρχίλοχον καὶ στᾶθι καὶ εἴσιδε τὸν πάλαι ποιητάν
τὸν τῶν ἰάμβων, οὗ τὸ μυρίον κλέος
διῆλθε κηπὶ νύκτα καὶ ποτ' ἀῶ.
ἦ ῥά νιν αἱ Μοῖσαι καὶ ὁ Δάλιος ἠγάπευν Ἀπόλλων,
ὡς ἐμμελής τ' ἐγένετο κηπιδέξιος
ἔπεά τε ποιεῖν πρὸς λύραν τ' ἀείδειν.

Stand and look upon the ancient singer of iambics,
Archilochus, whose great fame
has traversed to night and to dawn.
Him indeed the Muses and Delian Apollo loved,
because he was talented and clever
at making verses and at singing with the lyre.

The poem is conventionally identified as an inscription for a statue of Archilochus.[12] Whether it is such an inscription, or a poem playing with the fiction of being an inscription (as [Theocritus] *Ep.* 19 [G.-P. 13] on the tomb of Hipponax), the dual effect is the same. The poem calls the "viewer's" attention both to an image and to the poetry this image represents—calls the passer-by to Archilochus and "Archilochus." One of the striking features of this poem is that it might be read as referring to Archilochus as composer of three types of verse: iambic (line 2 ἰάμβων), hexameter (line 6 ἔπεα) and monody (line 6 πρὸς λύραν τ' ἀείδειν). Gow believed this last to refer rather to musical innovation.[13]

10. Bing (1993) 620. "I would like to call this interest [the intense antiquarian interest in poets who are dead and gone, in the literary greats of the distant past] the memorializing impulse. It consists, on the one hand, of the desire to honor the dead and keep their legacy alive. This includes the obligation to preserve and restore. We may, on the other hand, also see in this impulse an attempt to master that legacy, to assert control."

11. On the marble relief see N. M. Kontoleon, "Ἀρχαικὴ ζωφόρος ἐκ Πάρου," *Charisterion Orlandos,* I. (Athens, 1965), 348–418, C. Gasparri, "Archiloco a Taso," *QUCC,* n.s., 11 (1982): 33–41, Gentili (1988) 179–80. On the cult of Archilochus at Paros, its date and instantiation, see N. M. Kontoleon, "Archilochos und Paros," in *Archiloque.* Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique 10 (Geneva, 1964), 37–86, Bing (1993) 619–20.

12. So Gow II 545.

13. Gow II 546.

That the poem is itself composed of two Archilochians (each followed by an iambic trimeter and a catalectic iambic trimeter) is another way of memorializing. Noteworthy is the metaliterary play at line 1 Ἀρχί-λοχον and line 2 τὸν τῶν ἰάμβων underscoring the meters in which the poem is composed.

We encounter something of the same phenomenon with the epigrams which take as their origin the tomb of Hipponax. Thus an epigram such as Leon. Tar. *Ep.* 58 G.-P. may similarly be read as recalling at once the tomb of the poet Hipponax and his vituperative verse.[14] I want to emphasize here that in the Hellenistic period the archaic poet as cultural monument is a dual entity—the poet as figure from the distant past and the memorialization of the poet—and that the Hellenistic poets play with this duality; Callimachus' poem describing the tomb of Simonides (*Aetia* fr. 64) is an outstanding example. For an assessment of the archaic iambic poets as models for the statuary poems of the *Iambi,* this duality must be borne in mind. In other words, Callimachus has the earlier poets before him as models in two aspects, their own descriptive verse and the memorializations of them.

Callimachus' Statuary and Other Works of Art

The last two of Callimachus' hymns are representations of cult ritual.[15] Both poems capture moments of tension and expectation among attendants / followers of the ritual, and both poems use painstaking detail to establish the verisimilitude of the ritual moments that they are in fact not recording but creating. The fifth hymn is particularly valuable for a study of *Iambi* 6, 7, and 9, as it takes as its frame the ritual bathing of a statue in Argos. The setting is thus clearly distant from Alexandria and the intended audience of the poem. The statue is that of Athena Pallas, the *Palladion;* its cult (of which we know little[16]) includes a ritual bathing of this statue by Argive women. The bathing of the statue serves as a *prophasis* for the myth of the bathing goddess, the attendants of the statue replaced in the myth by the attendant nymphs,

14. See ch. 1, p. 36.

15. On the nature of the hymns and the problem this has posed in Callimachean scholarship see Bulloch (1985) 1–13 and Hopkinson (1984) 3–4, 35–39. "Verisimilitude" is the perfect word to describe many aspects of the statuary and other monumental poetry of Callimachus—I take the term from Bulloch (1985) 5. "The compass of the Fifth Hymn and the careful insertion of references to ceremonial particulars have to do not with realism, but verisimilitude. Indeed the very presence of such details betrays precisely the literary nature of our text."

16. See Bulloch (1985) 8–12 and 14–17.

and the chariot that bears the ritual object by Athena's own. The statue, in other words, is at once ritual object and myth evoked by the ritual object, and both myth and Argive cult are thus evoked and re-created in the hymn.

Aetia fr. 114[17] includes a dialogue between a passer-by and the statue of Apollo at Delos.[18] Even from the fragmentary lines we can see that the dialogue was both *aition* and description—the poem re-creates the statue.[19] Only the lines that are immediately concerned with the statue of Delian Apollo are given below.[20]

;] 'ναί, Δήλιος': 'ἦ σύ γε̣π̣η̣[
]ν;' 'ναί μὰ τὸν αὐτὸν ἐιμέ.'
;] 'ναί, χρύσεος' : 'ἦ καὶ ἀφα̣[ρής
μοῦνον] ζῶμα̣ μέ̣σον σ̣τ̣[ρέφεται.'
'τεῦ δ' ἕνεκεν σκαιῇ μὲν ἔ]χεις χερὶ Κύνθιε τ[όξον,
τὰς δ' ἐπὶ δεξιτερῇ] σὰς̣ ἰδανὰς Χάριτας;'
]ν ἵν' ἄφρονας ὑβρ[
ἀ]γαθοῖς ὀρέγω·
]ητοῖσι κολασμο[
ἀργό]τερος·
].εν φίλα χειρὶ δατ[.]ς̣.α̣ι
]ντες ἕτοιμον ἀεί,
ἵ]ν' ᾗ μετὰ καί τι νοῆσαι
] ἀγαθὸν βασιλεῖ.

?] "Yes, the Delian:" "And are you γε̣π̣η̣[
]ν?" "Yes by my very self."
?] "Yes, of gold." "And unclothed?"
"Only] a belt is entwined about my middle."
"And for what reason do you,] Cythian, hold a bow in your [left] hand,
and your lovely Graces [at your right]?"

17. This fragment of twenty-five lines is composed of a number of papyrus fragments, and appears to contain certainly two works of cult statuary (the statues of Milesian and Delian Apollo). There may possibly be a third votive object associated with the horses of Diomedes and the city of Argos, as D'Alessio (1996) 548–49 and (1995) 20–21 proposes. This would then suggest a fragment that includes three cult objects in three distinct places. A considerable amount of work has been done with this text since Pfeiffer. See D'Alessio (1996) in his notes on this fragment, and especially his article (1995) 5–21, and P. Borgonovo and P. Cappelletto "Callimaco frr. 114 e 115 Pf.: Apollo 'poligonale' e Apollo Delio," *ZPE* 103 (1994): 13–17.

18. On the dialogue form and the voice that addresses the statue see my comments on *Iambus* 9 below. Specifically on fr. 114 see esp. R. Kassel, "Dialoge mit Statuen," *ZPE* 51 (1983): 1–12.

19. And was used by R. Pfeiffer to enhance our knowledge of the statue from other literary and archaeological evidence in his "The Image of the Delian Apollo and Apolline Ethics," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 25 (1952): 20–32 (reprinted in Pfeiffer [1960] 55–71).

20. Text from D'Alessio (1996) 546–48. D'Alessio has very helpfully included Pfeiffer's emendations to his original text from the Add. et Corr. to both volumes.

]ν that the witless ὑβρ[
] I offer to good men.
]ητοῖcι κολαcμο[
]more slowly.
].εν dear things with my hand δατ[.]c̣.ᾳ̣ι
]ντεc ever prepared,
]that there may also be a change of heart
]a good thing for a king.

Here the poem "memorializes" both statue and god. The questions that the passer-by poses of the statue's provenance and material come to evoke not only physical re-creation in the mind of the poem's audience but also the re-creation of what Pfeiffer termed "Apolline ethics," and it is these latter that so perfectly incorporate the statue into the *Aetia*. Scholars have previously remarked upon the resemblance of this fragment, and of the other commemorative fragments of the *Aetia* (*The Tomb of Simonides* [fr. 64 Pf.], *The Statues of Hera at Samos* [frr. 100 and 101 Pf.]), to epigram. These resemblances occur both in regard to the self-descriptive or declarative aspect of these fragments and the seemingly anonymous viewer.[21] Indeed, Posidippus *Ep.* 19 G.-P. bears such a remarkable structural similarity to Callimachus fr. 114 that the resemblance may be more than one of generic similarity.[22] I would consider this resemblance from another perspective, from that of rewriting the conventions of epigram into other generic forms. Features of dedicatory epigrams are reconfigured to another context, here to *aition,* and in *Iambus* 7 to *iambos.*

Just as Callimachus varies statuary *aition* and *iambos* in importing the features of dedicatory epigram, so he varies dedicatory epigrams themselves.[23] While some are composed along the conventional lines of the genre, the self-declarative narrative of a contemporary votive object,[24] one that stands out as a variant of this type is *Ep.* 5 (14 G.-P.).[25] Here the votive object recounts its previous history and journey to its

21. So Pfeiffer to fr. 114 lines 4–17: "contra morem epicum poeta personas loquentes non nominat imitatus, ut opinor, ea epigrammata quae colloquii formam habent: v. epp. 13. 34. 61, Leonid. Tar. AP VII 163 al.; forma multo simpliciore utitur in fr. 199." See also Kassel (1983) 9–11. In *Aetia* fr. 100 *(The Most Ancient Statue of Hera at Samos)* the second person singular ἦcθα at line 2 also suggests a dialogue form.

22. See D'Alessio's (1996) astute comments 547, n. 4.

23. On this specific aspect of Callimachean epigram see P. Bing, "Ergänzungsspiel in the Epigrams of Callimachus," *A&A* 41 (1995): 115–31, Gutzwiller (1998) 190–96.

24. E.g. *Ep.* 55 (G.-P. 16), 24 (G.-P. 60).

25. The text is from Gow-Page, *HE,* Callim. *Ep.* 14 including Bentley's conjecture παλαίτερον line 1 for παλαίτεροc in Athenaeus, Schneider's ἴδ' ὡc τῶργῳ line 6 for ἰν' ὡcπεργῳ in Athenaeus.

present setting at greater length, developing a continuous play on the nature of sea travel and the honorifics of the dedicatee.

Κόγχος ἐγώ, Ζεφυρῖτι, παλαίτερον, ἀλλὰ cὺ νῦν με,
Κύπρι, Cεληναίης ἄνθεμα πρῶτον ἔχεις,
ναυτίλος ὃς πελάγεσσιν ἐπέπλεον, εἰ μὲν ἀήται,
τείνας οἰκείων λαῖφος ἀπὸ προτόνων,
εἰ δὲ γαληναίη, λιπαρὴ θεός, οὖλος ἐρέσσων
ποσσὶν—ἴδ' ὡς τῶργῳ τοὔνομα cυμφέρεται—
ἔστ' ἔπεσον παρὰ θῖνας Ἰουλίδας, ὄφρα γένωμαι
σοὶ τὸ περίσκεπτον παίγνιον, Ἀρσινόη,
μηδέ μοι ἐν θαλάμῃσιν ἔθ' ὡς πάρος—εἰμὶ γὰρ ἄπνους—
τίκτηται νοτερῆς ὤεον ἀλκυόνος.
Κλεινίου ἀλλὰ θυγατρὶ δίδου χάριν· οἶδε γὰρ ἐσθλά
ῥέζειν καὶ Cμύρνης ἐστὶν ἀπ' Αἰολίδος.

Long ago, Zephyritis, I was a conch, but now you,
Kypris, have me, the first votive offering of Selenaia,
I who used to sail as a nautilus on the seas, if there was a breeze,
stretching out my sail from my own forestays,
but if it was calm, radiant goddess, rapidly rowing
with my feet—and so my name is fitting to the action—
until I fell upon the shores of Iulis, that I might be
for you, Arsinoe, your much admired plaything,
nor in my chambers any longer as before—for I am without breath—
may the egg of the sea halcyon be laid.
But show favor to the daughter of Kleinias. For she knows
to do good works, and is from Aiolian Smyrna.

In this extended epigram the poet plays with many of the standard features of the dedicatory poem that might be expected to be associated with a votive object. In particular he plays upon the conceptualization of Arsinoe-Aphrodite as *Euploia,* the guardian of safe sea journey (for the end of the Nautilus' journey is ironically at once its arrival and its end). Here the description of the former material of the votive offering evolves into an extended disquisition on natural history.[26] The fiction of the poem inscribed on the object is stretched to the limit in the long winding period that encompasses the first ten lines of the poem. As in other statuary poetry of Callimachus, both the detailed description and the journey are foregrounded in a poem that utilizes its own generic traditions to create a βίος, a "life," of the votive object.

In turning to the statuary poems of the *Iambi* it is worthwhile to consider some of the features that characterize Callimachus' repre-

26. See K. Gutzwiller, "The Nautilus, the Halcyon, and Selenaia: Callimachus's *Epigram* 5 Pf. = 14 G.-P.," *CA* 11, 2 (1992): 194–209, Selden (1998) 309–13.

sentations of statuary and votive objects elsewhere in his poetry: (1) the detailed description, the reading of the object or viewing of the object through verse;(2) the history of the object; and (3) the range of geographic locations represented among the objects of these poems. This last has led some scholars to postulate extensive traveling on the part of Callimachus to in particular, Delos, Samos, Keos, and the northern Aegean (Thrace, possibly Samothrace, Olympia). Yet perhaps this is the less important aspect of the collection of objects commemorated in his poetry; more important is *that* they are so commemorated. As in so much of his work Callimachus deliberately and self-consciously evokes earlier poets and earlier poetry, so here he is doing something similar in his display of knowledge of works of art and dedicatory offerings. He is memorializing them for his Alexandrian audience, rendering in his poetry viewings of many objects spatially distant just as he alludes to poets who are distant in time.

Iambus 6

Iambi 6 and 7 are both epodes, as is *Iambus* 5, but they are different in meter and in dialect. Both 6 and 7 are composed in alternating iambic trimeters and ithyphallics in a literary Doric dialect. The thematic and structural parallels that link 6 and 7 as a pair are stronger yet. Both poems are concerned with statues, the first of grand, the second of less grand origin and material. In *Iambus* 6 the statue is described, in *Iambus* 7 the statue describes. In *Iambus* 6 the poet addresses an acquaintance, in *Iambus* 7 the statue addresses the poem's audience. In *Iambus* 6 the addressee is setting off on a journey to view or marvel at (Dieg. VII 26 κατὰ θέαν [to see the sight of]) the statue, in *Iambus* 7 the statue makes a journey to become the subject of wonder of the fishermen of Ainos.

While three of the *Iambi* are concerned with statues, the statues themselves have quite varying cultural significance. The statue of Hermes in *Iambus* 7 is established as a cult object in distant Thrace. The statue of Hermes in *Iambus* 9 is an expected figure at a gymnasium or a wrestling-school. The statue of Zeus at Olympia, however, was one of the most renowned artworks of the Greek world. The description of Pheidias' huge chryselephantine sculpture in a collection of iambic poems is in and of itself a declaration, a positioning of the poet in regard to expected and traditional delimitations of the elevated and the unelevated.

The poem encompassed, as the fragmentary lines show, a detailed

description of the measurements of the statue.[27] Yet the poem is not only one of measurements. Interspersed among the details of one of the most famous cult objects of the Greek world are touches of the far less elevated, references to animals of fable, to greed, and an overall tone of bantering informality.

Iambus 6 is one of the most problematic poems of the collection, and has found relatively little favor among modern critics, whom it has in general greatly perplexed.[28] The usual attempt to classify the work as a *propemptikon*[29] is itself rather problematic.[30] The departure of the acquaintance is the *prophasis* for the poem, not the subject.[31] Part of the conceit of the work lies in the exactness of the description, which has weighed heavily on modern readers.[32] The exactness is, however, deliberate, and more likely meant to evoke in the verse description the exactness of the creative process of the sculptor.[33] From this exactness derives the irony of the poem, that the poet in Alexandria has as accurate a vision of the cult statue as he who is traveling to see it. In this respect there is a parallel in the theme of *Iambus* 13, that the poet need

27. Cf. Strab. 8.353–54, who refers to this poem of Callimachus (Καλλ. ἐν Ἰάμβῳ τινι) as one recording of the statue's measurements, and Paus. 5.11.9, a criticism of those who attempted to measure the statue, which may have been in part directed at the measurements of *Iambus* 6. See R. Pfeiffer, "The Measurements of the Zeus at Olympia—New Evidence from an Epode of Callimachus," *JHS* 61 (1941): 1–5 (reprinted in Pfeiffer [1960] 71–79), and D'Alessio (1996) 621, n. 103. D'Alessio refers (*ibid.*) to A. Mallwitz, *Die Werkstatt des Pheidias in Olympia* (Berlin, 1964), 75–78 for an assessment that takes into account more recent archaeological evidence.

28. Cf. Trypanis (1958) 130: "*Iambus* VI was a *propemptikon,* a poem to wish 'bon voyage' to a departing friend. As far as we can see there is little poetic inspiration here: the object is the display of a great deal of erudite detail, as well as a peculiar sense of humour in setting that kind of material in immaculate verse." Cf. also Dawson (1950) 72: "There is little poetic inspiration here; one is tempted to share the opinion expressed by Pausanias (V, 11, 9) [he then cites the passage]. The poet indulged in a tour de force, putting into verse some paragraphs from an ancient Baedeker, displaying τέχνη rather than ἐνθουσιασμός, and admirably illustrating the criticism of Ovid (*Amores,* I, 15, 14): *quamvis ingenio non valet, arte valet.*" Clayman (1980) 34 largely follows Dawson in his assessment. Rather more perspicacious is Hutchinson (1988) 26–27.

29. So Norsa and Vitelli (1934) 9, and the majority of commentators since.

30. See Pfeiffer (1941) 1 (1960, 73): "We might therefore call the poem, with the first editors, a 'Propempticon', but it would be a quite peculiar specimen of that genre."

31. Pfeiffer thought the first fragmentary lines to refer to the journey of the addressee (cf. my notes above to line 11 .ανδ̣ιφ. . . . [[and line 12 Πῖς̣αν), but given the state of the opening lines this must remain a hypothesis only. The opening lines of the Diegesis suggest that a journey by sea may have been mentioned in the text; this may also be an assumption on the part of the diegete.

32. Cf. Hutchinson's (1988) judicious comments in his introductory remarks to this poem pp. 26–27.

33. Cf. *Iambus* 12.66 καίπερ εὖ cμίλῃcιν ἠκ̣ριβ̣ωμένην [even though executed with such precision with chisels].

not go to the Ephesus of Hipponax in order to be able to compose Hipponactean choliambic verse. Both statue and verse are re-created in Callimachus' compositions. Aspects of interweaving of levels of high and low are clearly visible in *Iambus* 6 in the references to the fable of the tortoise and the hare (22), the language of the rivalry of the Horai with the Graces (43–44 οὐδὲ πάς[cα]λο̣[ν | φαντὶ μειονεκτεῖν [say they do not fall short by so much as a peg]) and the choice of the adjective λίχνοc [greedy] to describe the addressee's desire for more detail. The lost portions of the poem may well have illustrated this interweaving to a far greater degree.

The significance of *Iambus* 6 lies in part in the object portrayed and in part in the manner of portrayal. Objects in archaic iambic are often of a somewhat humble nature. The antithesis of this humble nature is the ivory and gold statue of Zeus at Olympia. To portray such a figure in iambic verse is to transcend any generic limitation. At the same time to portray such a figure with a certain amount of traditional iambic language and imagery is to put the statue in a varied and novel light. Further, the figure of Olympian Zeus sits (as it were) at the center of the collection of *Iambi,* and *Iambus* 6 is the first of several that have divine themes.[34] There is a certain parallel here with the structure of the hymns, which also begin with the figure of Zeus.

Little remains of the opening twenty-one lines of *Iambus* 6 (preserved by *PSI* 1216). Yet the first line, the lemma of the Diegesis, tantalizes the modern reader with its antithesis of divine and human, object and craft. The poem's first word ̓Aȷλεῖ̣̣ο̣c [of Elis] immediately evokes a setting geographically distant from Alexandria. *Iambi* 7 and 12 show the same feature in the opening line (*Iambus* 7.1 Αἰνίων θεόc [god of the Aineans], *Iambus* 12.1 ῞Αρτειμι Κρηταῖον ̓Αμνιcοῦ πέδον [Artemis, who goes about the Cretan plain of Amnisus]). The emphasis on Pheidias the Athenian, son of Charmides, at the end of the diegete's summary seems to parallel a similar emphasis at the end of the poem (lines 58–62). *Iambus* 6 begins and ends with Pheidias, and as such is a memorialization of the sculptor in verse.

τέχνη [artistic skill] is a term with specific associations in Callimachus of divine excellence in creativity. All of the instances of the word in Callimachus' extant poetry underscore a close bond of divine instruction and mortal execution of artistic creation.[35] In two cases the

34. *Iambus* 6: Olympian Zeus, 7: Hermes Perpheraios, 9: Hermes Geneiolas, 10: Aphrodite of Mount Castnion, 12: the birthday fête of Hebe.

35. Fr. 176.5]ανου γὰρ ἀπευθέα τεχν[.]. [is the one instance where the validity of this observation cannot be proven. The juxtaposition of ἀπευθέα (those things which cannot be sought or learned by inquiry) and τέχν[η?] is an intriguing one.

two aspects are conjoined in the person of the god Apollo as artistic creator (*Iambus* 12.56 χρεὼ cοφῆc ὦ Φοῖβε π. [. .]. cθ. . τ̣έ̣χνηc [There is need now, Phoebus, of wise π. [. .]. cθ craft], *Hy.* 2.42 τέχνῃ δ' ἀμφιλαφὴc οὔτιc τόcον ὅccον Ἀπόλλων [in skill there is no one as great as Apollo]). The parallel position of the name of the god at the caesura and that of Pheidias at the end of the line underscores this relationship of mortal and divine, with the added touch that Zeus is both god and the object of Pheidias' creation.

The text of *P. Oxy.* 2171 fr. 2, col. II, which preserves lines 22–49 of *Iambus* 6, opens with a reference to the fable of the tortoise and the hare at line 22 λαγὸc χελύναν. The fable of the tortoise and the hare appears among the fables of Aesop (420 Haus. = 226 Perry) and Babrius (fr. 11 Luzzatto-La Penna). It is unclear to what the fable refers in *Iambus* 6. At this point the poem has turned to the viewing of the statue, and the connective κ̣αί in the following line may suggest that the fable is drawn either to some aspect of the statue itself or to the viewing of it. More striking is the appearance of this fable in the context of the description of the statue. The juxtaposition of the animal figures from folk motif with the material and the size of the parts of the throne and statue of Zeus at Olympia is a vivid one.

The remaining description of the statue encompasses a number of the signal features of Callimachean poetics and poetic style. Gold is the material especially associated with gods in Callimachus' poetry; hence the effectiveness of Apollo's comments on its ephemeral qualities in *Iambus* 12. Line 29 Λ̣υδιεργέc [of Lydian workmanship] is a *hapax legomenon* referring here to some aspect of the throne. The adjective has a parallel in the form Κορινθιουργέc [of Corinthian workmanship], which occurs in Apollonius of Rhodes (fr. 1 Powell):

> Κορινθιουργές ἐστι κιόνων σχῆμα
>
> The form of the columns is of Corinthian workmanship

This line of Apollonius is thought to have been part of a description of the temple of Sarapis at Canopus (although this has been debated; see Powell's comments on this fragment). If the fragment is indeed from such a description, it bears two similarities to our poem. The description is of a large religious monument and is in iambic verse. There may also have been a journey of an addressed would-be viewer (see fr. 2 Powell). There are several correspondences with Apollonius in Callimachus' *Iambi* (*Iambus* 8 being only the most obvious contextual instance), and there are many in the *Aetia*. The memorialization of art objects in verse, an expansion of the *ecphrasis* to reconfigure types of

artistic creation, appears to have been a shared poetic interest of the two contemporaries.

Lydia, and associations with Lydia, occur elsewhere in Callimachus, and indeed elsewhere in the *Iambi*. *Iambus* 4.6–8 ἔ̣ν κοτε Τμώλῳ | δάφνην ἐλαίῃ νεῖικος οἱ πάλαι Λυδοί | λέγουσι θέσθαι [the Lydians of old say that once on Tmolus the laurel took up a quarrel with the olive], and (assuming this reading) *Iambus* 13.47 Λυδὸν] πρὸς αὐ̣λόν [to Lydian flute]. Lydia evokes a context distant both spatially and historically.

At line 37 αὐτὸς δ' ὁ δαίμων [the god himself] the speaker plays on the dual nature of the cult statue, art object and deity. The substantive δαίμων [god or spirit] and its inflected forms occur twenty-four times in the extant work of Callimachus,[36] in some cases a specific deity is meant, in others a more abstract conceptualization of the divine. In no other case does the poet use this term for a work of art. There is another such subtle use of anthropomorphism of statuary with the speaking Horai at lines 42–44.

Line 39 Νίκα [victory] is the statue of gold and ivory that stood in the right hand of Zeus (see Paus. 5.11.1). It is unfortunately not clear whether this figure received similar touches of personification in the poem as did Zeus and the Horai. Three Graces (Χάριτες) and three Horai (line 42 παρθένοι γὰρ ἍΩραι) stood on either side, apparently above the head of Zeus.[37] These the speaker characterizes as rivals in stature. Line 43 πάς̣[σα]λο̣[ν [a peg] serves at once as a metaphor of measurement and as an introduction of the colloquial into the portrayal of the Horai and the Graces.[38] There is a light touch of humor in the introduction of so small an object in the comparison of such large statues; both Graces and Horai are 6 ft. (1.98 meters) in height. The statues speak (line 44 φαντὶ μειονεκτεῖν), a further touch of personification, and one that playfully suggests an element of rivalry between the two choruses. As Pfeiffer observes: "This seems to me a rather charming way of implying that the Horai feel a certain pride: they stress the fact that they receive the same treatment as the Charites, whom the artist as well as the poet always respected highly."[39] Callimachus has a

36. Further on the sense of δαίμων see Bulloch (1985) 187 (and notes), Hopkinson (1984) 107–8.

37. Paus. 5.11.7 ἐπὶ δὲ τοῖς ἀνωτάτω τοῦ θρόνου πεποίηκεν ὁ Φειδίας ὑπὲρ τὴν κεφαλὴν τοῦ ἀγάλματος τοῦτο μὲν Χάριτας, τοῦτο δὲ Ὥρας, τρεῖς ἑκατέρας. [In addition to these things high above the throne Pheidias made above the head of the statue Graces and Horai, three of each.] Cf. Pfeiffer (1941) 4–5 (1960, 78–79).

38. Cf. Ar. *Eccl.* 284 ἔχουσι μηδὲ πάτταλον, Luc. *Iud. Voc.* 9 ὡς τὸ δὴ λεγόμενον μηδὲ πάσσαλόν μοι καταλιπεῖν.

39. Pfeiffer (1941) 5 (=1960, 78–79).

similar use of the comparative genitive in description in *Ep.* 48.3–5 (26 G.-P.) ἐγὼ δ' ἀνὰ τῇδε κεχηνώc . . . παιδαρίων Διόνυcοc ἐπήκοοc.

The adjective λίχνοc [greedy] (line 45) imparts another colloquial touch, as well as a play on both the extensive nature of the recitation of detail and the narrator's relation to his addressee. The figure of the traveling acquaintance is suddenly foregrounded in a manner, as Hutchinson has noted,[40] which puts the preceding lengthy account in a somewhat different light. The parenthesis introduces a metatextual element in which the poet comments humorously on his own work.[41] With his reference to dialogue at line 46 καὶ⌋ τό μευ πυθέcθαι [to learn this too of me], Callimachus also recasts the poem and the figure of the narrator. The first two books of the *Aetia* were composed in dialogue form between the poet and several omniscient Muses. Here in *Iambus* 6 the poet, describing the statue to the would-be viewer, casts himself, with a certain humor, into the role of the omniscient figure.

The poem comes to a conclusion at lines 58–61 with the figure of Pheidias, with whom it opened. The references to the father of Pheidias (61 ὁ Φειδία πατ[ήρ) and to the sculptor's Athenian origin (60]'Αθανᾳ[) suggest that the poet may have included here elements of the actual epigram, and an overall allusion to this epigram itself, which was inscribed on the base of the statue.[42] The final moment of this "reading" of the statue is thus the reading of the artist's "signature," and so a final touch of verisimilitude in this viewing of a work of art in verse.

To line 62 ἀπέρχευ [go on forth] Pfeiffer notes the parallel of *Ep.* 40.6 (48 G.-P.) ἔρπε χαίρων [go and farewell], which is especially suggestive. This is a funerary epigram[43] that speaks both as tomb and as

40. Hutchinson (1988) 27, "The device of the parenthesis makes as light as possible in outward form this clear intimation of humour and absurdity in the entire conception of the poem. The strong word λίχνος 'greedy' with obvious but graceful comedy shows the contrast between the friend, actually eager for aesthetic experience, and the speaker, bent on retailing fact. This play with personality is used to stress that for its total effect the poem depends on what lies outside its pretended boundaries."

41. A device Callimachus uses with similar effect elsewhere; e.g. fr. 75.4–7, *Ep.* 5.9 (14 G.-P.) εἰμὶ γὰρ ἄπνουc, "for I am without breath."

42. Cf. Paus. 5.10.2 Φειδίαν δὲ τὸν ἐργαcάμενον τὸ ἄγαλμα εἶναι καὶ ἐπίγραμμά ἐcτιν ἐc μαρτυρίαν ὑπὸ τοῦ Διὸc γεγραμμένον τοῖc ποcί· 'Φειδίαc Χαρμίδου υἱὸc 'Αθηναῖόc μ' ἐποίηcε' [And an epigram inscribed below the feet of Zeus testifies that Pheidias created the statue: 'Pheidias the Athenian son of Charmides made me'] (F. v. Hiller, *Hist. griech. Epigr.* 48).

43. Callim. *Ep.* 40 (48 G.-P.)

ἱερέη Δήμητροc ἐγώ ποτε καὶ πάλιν Καβείρων,
ὦνερ, καὶ μετέπειτα Δινδυμήνηc
ἡ γρηὺc γένομην, ἡ νῦν κόνιc †η νο

the figure of the woman commemorated. Here at the end of *Iambus* 6 the traveler is bid to go forth by a voice that may be the poet's, but which is also appropriate for both statue and commemorated god. At the same time the second person imperative preserves the conceit that the poem is a dialogue between the prospective viewer of the statue and the poet.

The *ecphrasis* is a feature of Greek poetry from a very early period, and one that already had an extensive and varied tradition by the Hellenistic era. The Hellenistic poets in turn brought great ingenuity to its use. Indeed, its prevalence is widely considered to be one of the hallmarks of Hellenistic poetry generally. *Iambus* 6 is both a part of this tradition, and in some significant ways rather a striking variant. Whereas many of the more famous *ecphrases* of Hellenistic poetry, Jason's cloak (Ap. Rh. 1.721–67) or the basket borne by Moschus' Europa, contribute to the verisimilitude of mythological objects, while others (e.g. the goatherd's cup of Theocr. *Id.* 1) effect a change in the appreciation of seemingly humble objects, *Iambus* 6 is a detailed description of a statue of Zeus that was both real and enormous. The grandeur of the subject is softened by the touches of iambic, the insertion of animal fable and unelevated vocabulary, and particularly by the juxtaposition of this statuary poem with the one that follows.

Iambus 7

The central figure of *Iambus* 7 is again the representation of an enthroned deity, here the cult statue of Hermes Perpheraios in the city of Ainos in Thrace. *Iambus* 7 is, also like *Iambus* 6, an epode of alternating iambic trimeters and ithyphallics. The two poems mirror one another in many respects, whether in similarity or difference. It seems likely that Callimachus conceived of these two as a pair, to be appreciated in light of one another.[44] Each poem involves a journey, in *Iambus* 6 of the prospective viewer, in *Iambus* 7 of the cult statue. Both

---

πολλῶν προcταcίη νέων γυναικῶν.
καί μοι τέκν' ἐγένοντο δύ' ἄρcενα κὴπέμυc' ἐκείνων
εὐγήρωc ἐνὶ χερcίν. ἔρπε χαίρων.

I was once priestess of Demeter, sir,
and again of the Cabiri, and after of Dindymene,
I an old woman, who now am dust,
was protector of many young women.
And two male children were born to me, and in good old age
I closed my eyes in their arms. Go and farewell.

44. On the paired elements of *Iambi* 1 and 13 see my discussion above, ch. 2. In considering *Iambi* 6 and 7 as a pair it is worth keeping in mind the parallel of *Hymns* 5 and 6.

poems play and elaborate on the concept of dedicatory epigram. *Iambus* 6 appears to conclude with allusion to the actual epigram on the statue of Zeus in Olympia; *Iambus* 7 opens with the type of first person statement typical of ἀναθήματα, only for this to evolve into autobiographical aretalogy. The sculptor of the statue of Zeus at Olympia is a historical figure. The sculptor of the statue of Hermes at Ainos is a mytho-historical one. The statue of Zeus is chryselephantine. The statue of Hermes is a simple ξόανον, a wooden cult image. The statue of Zeus at Olympia was a *chef d'oeuvre* of its sculptor, and renowned as such throughout the Greek-speaking world. The statue of Hermes Perpheraios describes itself as a πάρεργον [minor work] of Epeius, creator of the Trojan horse.

Two aspects of the opening lines of the poem that instantly strike the audience are the first person speaker and the dialect. And, indeed, it is the first word of the second line, the deceptively simple ἔμμι [I am], which at once reveals both. The form is one of several Aeolic ones interspersed in a poem that is otherwise composed in a literary Doric; *Iambus* 6 is also in a literary Doric dialect. Dawson suggested that this might be a Cyrenean dialect,[45] and the scholarship on the poem has generally followed this interpretation. More recently D'Alessio has proposed that the use of Aeolic forms in the poem may be due rather to the fact that Ainos was an Aeolic colony.[46] Callimachus is clearly alluding in part to the dialect of this poem at *Iambus* 13.18 in relating the charges brought against his collection of iambic verse:

τοῦτ' ἐμπ[έ]πλεκται καὶ λαλευc ι[. .]. . [
'Ιαcτὶ καὶ Δωριcτὶ καὶ τὸ cύμμικ|τ̣ο̣ν[.

this is interwoven and chatter[ing?]
in the Ionic and Doric and the intermingled fashion.

The variation of dialect in a poetic tradition associated with sixth-century Ionia was a deliberate one, as was the importation of generic

45. Dawson (1950) 81: "One of the objections to earlier identification of the epode [sc. *Iambus* 7] was the Doric character of its dialect, whereas the Hephaestion citation suggested a poem in Aeolic; it seems much more likely that Callimachus used neither Doric nor Aeolic in this *Iambus*, but something like a Cyrenaic dialect, basically Doric with vestiges of forms akin to Aeolic." On the Cyrenaic dialect see C. D. Buck, "The Dialect of Cyrene," *CP* 41 (1946): 130–32. On the supposed influence of Cyrenaic on the Hellenistic edition of archaic lyric cf. A. C. Cassio, "Alcmane, il dialetto di Cirene e la filologia allessandrina," *RFIC* 121 (1993): 24–36.

46. D'Alessio (1996) 627, n. 113: "Il dialetto usato, oltre a caratteristiche 'doriche' (cfr. VI), presenta tinte eoliche. Questo sarà da collegare, piuttosto che ad una presunta influenza del cireneo, al fatto che Ainos stessa era colonia eolica."

features of other genres into *iambos*. Both are indicative of generic and cultural refashioning.

Callimachus introduces the first person speaker in a particularly effective manner. The opening line of *Iambus* 7 is structurally and metrically similar to that of *Iambus* 6. In both poems the cult statue of the divinity appears before the first-line caesura. With a sleight of hand at the beginning of the second line it turns out to be the statue that is the speaker, whereas in *Iambus* 6 the statue, named with its maker (as frequently in dedicatory epigrams), is not. And the conceit of *Iambus* 7, that this is the inscription on a votive object, develops into a far longer biographical narrative.

Iambus 7 is an unusual poem. The form, the lengthy autobiographical narrative of an art object representing a deity, prefigures the first person narratives in Latin literature of Propertius 4.2 (the image of Vertumnus), Horace *Sat.* 1.8 (the statue of Priapus), Tibullus 1.4 (also Priapus) and the *Priapeia* in both languages.[47] However, earlier parallels in Greek literature are far fewer. As Pfeiffer notes, the detailed narrative of the statue's powers brings the poem close to aretalogy.[48] At the same time the composition is also etiological, explaining both the foundation of the cult and the appearance of the statue, and especially the origin of the statue's wound. In this last aspect *Iambus* 7 has a parallel in *Iambus* 9, also a statue of Hermes and also an *aition*. Were the statue of Hermes in the later poem indeed associated with the mysteries of the Cabiri at Samothrace, there would be the further parallel of the two representations of cult statues of Hermes associated with places geographically distant from Alexandria.

Iambus 7 is extremely lacunose. Two papyrus fragments (*P. Oxy.* 2171, *P. Oxy.* 661) preserve some thirty-eight lines of which only the first two (both cited by Hephaistion and the first by the diegete) are complete. From the fragmentary remains we discern several tantalizing features, such as alternation of speaker, alternation of grand and simple imagery, and a certain self-ironizing humor on the part of the statue-speaker.

The Diegesis to *Iambus* 7 is particularly lengthy and detailed, including both the myth of the statue's journey by water to Thrace and an etymology of the cult title Perpheraios. As is the case with the Diegesis to *Iambus* 1, it is likely that the length and degree of detail indi-

47. Some representations of Hermes Perpheraios represent the enthroned image as ithyphallic, another similarity with figures of Priapus.

48. "Mercurius miram sui ipsius potestatem fabula manifestam facit; 'aretalogiam' igitur hunc epodum esse dicas."

cate that the version of the tale given in the poem is in some aspects markedly different from other known versions. It includes mythological, folkloric, and etiological elements as well as a particularly vivid narrative that follows each step of the statue's tale. Given the lacunose nature of *Iambus* 7, the Diegesis is especially important for an assessment of the poem's occasion and significance.

Hermes Perpheraios is a cult deity of the city of Ainos in Thrace, whose image is preserved on many coins from Ainos.[49] The original wooden cult image, or ξόανον, is depicted as standing on a throne. I call attention here especially to this aspect of the image's portrayal for the juxtaposition of this enthroned image with that of the chryselephantine Zeus in *Iambus* 6. The tale of the image of a deity discovered by some fishermen in their nets has a remarkable parallel in that of an image of Dionysus Phallen at Methymna told by Pausanias (10.19.3) and cited from the Cynic Oenomaus by Eusebius.[50] Both aretalogical tales involve an image made from wood that fishermen, on taking in their nets, at first fail to recognize as that of a god. This they cast back into the sea, but in the end the statue is established, on an oracle's advice, as an object of veneration. The two tales clearly follow the same folkloric paradigm,[51] and both might be said to derive from a tradition

49. See J. M. F. May, *Ainos: Its History and Coinage, 474–341 B.C.* (Oxford, 1950), 57–65 and relevant plates. Of particular interest are the figures of the cult image of Hermes Perpheraios standing on a throne. Cf. ibid. 272–74 on *Iambus* 7 and the representation of the enthroned cult statue. See also C. Picard, "Le sculpteur Épeios: Du cheval de Troie au taureau de Phalaris," *RN* 5th ser. 6 (1942): 1–22, esp. 2–6 on the ξόανον, J. Bousquet "Callimaque, Hérodote, et le trône de l'Hermès de Samothrace," *RA* 6th ser., vols. 29–30, [=*Mélanges d'archéologie, et d'histoire offerts à C. Picard I*] (1948 [1949]): 105–31.

50. Paus. 10.19.3 ἁλιεῦσιν ἐν Μηθύμνῃ τὰ δίκτυα ἀνείλκυσεν ἐκ θαλάσσης πρόσωπον ἐλαίας ξύλου πεποιημένον· τοῦτο ἰδέαν παρείχετο φέρουσαν μέν τι ἐς τὸ θεῖον, ξένην δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ θεοῖς Ἑλληνικοῖς οὐ καθεστῶσαν. εἴροντο οὖν οἱ Μηθυμναῖοι τὴν Πυθίαν ὅτου θεῶν ἢ καὶ ἡρώων ἐστὶν ἡ εἰκών. ἡ δὲ αὐτοὺς σέβεσθαι Διόνυσον Φαλλῆνα ἐκέλευσεν. ἐπὶ τούτῳ οἱ Μηθυμναῖοι ξόανον μὲν τὸ ἐκ τῆς θαλάσσης παρὰ σφίσιν ἔχοντες καὶ θυσίαις καὶ εὐχαῖς τιμῶσι, χαλκοῦν δὲ ἀποπέμπουσιν ἐς Δελφούς. [The nets of some fishermen in Methymna drew up a face made of olivewood from the sea. This showed a form that was, true, divine, but foreign and not customary among gods of the Hellenes. So the Methymnians asked the Pythia of what god or hero the likeness was. And she commanded them to worship Dionysus Phallen. Whereupon the Methymnians keeping the statue from the sea in their midst honor it with sacrifices and prayers, and send bronze to Delphi.] Eus. *Praep. ev.* V 36, 1–4 (=fr. 13 Hammerstaedt). See also Hammerstaedt's notes pp. 225–28. The narration in this passage of the fishermen catching the image and casting it back into the sea (lines 14–20) is very similar to this part of the Diegesis to *Iambus* 7. Both narratives appear to follow the same folktale motif (cf. also e.g. Hdt. 3.40–43 on the ring of Polycrates).

51. J. Kroll, "Das Gottesbild aus dem Wasser," *Märchen, Mythos, Dichtung: Festschrift zum 90. Geburtstag Friedrich von der Leyens* (Munich, 1963), 251–68 suggests that the original model for these narratives is that of the water journey of the dead Osiris in the

of tales of fishermen. This Callimachus integrates, as he does animal fable, into his composition. Indeed, part of the conceit of *Iambus* 7 is that the cult object is so humble (cf. line 3 πάρεργον [minor work], line 25 φθόρον [piece of rubbish], and Dieg. VIII 7 βόλον [catch]) and found by such humble men.[52]

The Diegesis concludes with an etymology of the cult title Perpheraios, which presumably was contained in the poem. Each man passes (πε̣[ριφέρω]ν) the image around from another.[53] The cult title is more usually equated to that of Zeus Perpheretas or Pherpheretas.[54] Callimachus may well have evolved a different etymology here, and its inclusion in the diegete's summary suggests as much.

The effect of the epithet τῶ φιυγαίχμα [the coward] following on the seeming grandeur of the opening line of the poem is deliberate. God and coward are set each at the end of the line, effecting a jarring juxtaposition. This is continued in the third line, where there is a similar contrast of the grand, the builder of the Trojan horse and the small, the πάρεργον [minor work]. There is an extensive tradition of Epeius' cowardice in Hellenistic and later Greek poetry.[55] The term πάρεργον with which the speaker characterizes itself is a marked contrast also to the statue of *Iambus* 6; the chryselephantine Zeus was the major work of

---

Nile. In considering journeys of divine figures in Callimachus and possible Egyptian models fr. 228 Pf. *(The Deification of Arsinoe)* deserves careful examination. The motif of wounded votive statue recurs in the representations and narratives of wounded images of the Virgin and saints in several countries; L. Battezzato has brought that of the Vergine dello Schiaffo in Vercelli to my attention.

52. Cf. Puelma Piwonka (1949) 288.

53. Perhaps in some sort of race. See Kroll (1963) 251–52 n. 2: "Im Kult dieser Götter aus dem Meere muß es ein Dromenon gegeben haben." Cf. the ritual at the end of *Hy.* 6 lines 316–24 and the scholia on this race.

54. Or the Macedonian cult title Zeus Hyperberetas; see Pfeiffer in his commentary. Picard (1942) 8–11 attempts to link this title with that of the Περφερέες, the five men sent by the Hyperboreans to bring sacrificial offerings to Delian Apollo. Although this embassy does appear in two other contexts in Callimachus (fr. 186 [*Hyperboreans*] lines 8–10, *Hy.* 4.284–85), there is no indication in the Diegesis to *Iambus* 7 or in the poem as we have it that the Hyperboreans or the cult of Delian Apollo were in any way a part of this composition. Cf. Dawson (1950) 81, D'Alessio (1996) 627, n. 114.

55. Cf. Lyc. *Alex.* 930–31 'Ο δ' ἱπποτέκτων Λαγαρίας ἐν ἀγκάλαις, | ἔγχος πεφρικὼς καὶ φάλαγγα θουρίαν [The horse-builder in the arms of Lagaria, he fearful of the spear and the rushing phalanx], Simias Rhod. Πέλεκυς line 5 οὐκ ἐνάριθμος γεγαὼς ἐν προμάχοις 'Αχαιῶν [not numbered among the front lines of the Achaeans], (another instance of a smaller object, here the tool, πέλεκυς, metonymous for the builder of the Trojan horse, cf. line 5 of *Iambus* 7 c]κ̣έ̣παρνον). On the cowardice of Epeius cf. also Q. Smyrn. 4.323, 12.28. A fragment attributed to the comic poet Cratinus 'Επειοῦ δειλότερος (*PCG* Adespota 952) suggests that the tradition is earlier than Callimachus. Vergil notably does not follow this tradition; Epeius "ipse doli fabricator" [he who conceived the ruse], (*Aen.* 2.264) is the last of the figures he lists as concealed in the wooden horse.

Pheidias. Line 4 [ὡ]νήρ [the man] is presumably Epeius. The narrative now seems to have turned for the next several lines (until the swollen Scamander of line 13) to the construction of the statue. The tools of Epeius (here line 5 c]κέ̣παρνον [adze]) were a recurrent emblem of his mytho-historical creation.[56] The tools of artistic construction are also a recurrent motif of the *Iambi: Iambus* 12.27 πολλὰ τ̣ε̣χνήεντα ποικ[ίλ]α γλ[υφῇ [artfully and variously wrought by carving], ibid. 66 καίπερ εὖ cμίλῃcιν ἠ|κ̣ριβ̣ωμένην [even though executed with such precision with chisels], *Iambus* 13 Dieg. IX 37–38 ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τὸν τέκτονά τιc μέμφεται πολυειδῆ | cκεύη τεκταινόμενον, [Nor does anyone find fault with a builder for creating a variety of artifacts].

By line 13 Cκάμα[ν]ιδροc ἀγριωμένοc [the furious Scamander], the poem turned to the statue's original displacement and journey. The term ἀγριωμένοc is probably polyvalent here. While this term appears elsewhere of raging waters (cf. Lucian *Tox.* 20 ἐc πέλαγοc οὕτως ἠγριωμένον [to a sea so raging]), the image appears also to evoke something of the raging Scamander of *Iliad* 21, especially recalling Achilles' prayer that he not be swept away by the swollen and raging river at lines 273–83.

As several other first person narratives in the *Iambi,* that of *Iambus* 7 encompasses several speaking voices, and apparently several types of speech. At line 19 ὦ Παλαίμονεc [O gods of the sea],[57] the statue seems to relate the words of the fishermen who hauled him in with their catch (cf. 17 με δικτύοιc [me with nets]). The fishermen refer to the statue as θηρίον (21) [monster] and φθόρον (25) [piece of rubbish]. It is clear even in these fragmentary lines that the narrative is interspersed with several speeches: 41 ἔλεγ' ὁ μῦθοc [his speech ended], 45 οἱ δ' εἶπαν, [and they said]. The singular imperative ἄ̣πωθε [throw away] at line 25 suggests a verbal interaction among the fishermen. Generally Callimachus uses the word μῦθοc (41) of significant utterance, whether of received story or of speech. It would seem very likely then that the speech that ends at this line may have been extensive, and thus have contributed to the dramatic effect of the attempt to burn the statue. The statue is victorious also through verbal utterance (44 ταῖc ἐμαῖc ἐπῳδα[ῖc [with my incantations]). This is the statue's tool in its victory over impending destruction by fire, and at the same time a vivid asso-

56. On the axe of Epeius at the temple of Athena at Metapontum see Justin *Epit.* 20.2.1. Cf. the Πέλεκυς of Simias of Rhodes, OCT *Bucolici Graeci* (ed. A. S. F. Gow) 174–75. On this and the other *Technopaegnia* see Cameron (1995) 33–38.

57. The Palaimones are the gods of the sea, plural by metonymy of Palaimon, the sea god called Melecrites, son of Ino. Melecrites also appears in the fourth book of the *Aetia* (frr. 91–92 Pf.).

ciation of the statue with the god it represents. The word ἐπῳδή [incantation, charm] appears in one other context in Callimachus, in *Ep.* 46 (3 G.-P.) 9–10 αἱ γὰρ ἐπῳδαί | οἴκοι τῷ χαλεπῷ τραύματος ἀμφότεραι, [charms I have at home of both kinds against the savage wound], where the term is one of several playful medical/incantational images;[58] see also the language that the diegete uses at lines 9–10 τὸν ὦμον παί | cαντεc τραύματοc τύπον. As there is something of a play on the word in the Polyphemus epigram, so there may well be here in a poem which is itself an ἐπῳδός.

Three of the *Iambi* (7, 9, and 11) are variations on the epigraphic tradition of *oggetti parlanti*.[59] *Iambus* 9, like *Iambus* 7, is the utterance of a speaking statue of the god Hermes. In *Iambus* 9 Callimachus varies this conceit. The statue speaks not in soliloquy but rather engages in dialogue, and not only in dialogue with an anonymous exterior figure, a fictive viewer, as is the case with the statue of the Delian Apollo (fr. 114 Pf.), but with a specified person, the *erastes* of the handsome Philetades.

Iambus 9

Only these two lines of this *Iambus* have survived. These are preserved in a papyrus fragment of a commentary to Nicander's *Theriaca;* the first line also survives as the lemma of the Diegesis. If we can ascribe fr. 221 Pf. αἰτοῦμεν εὐμάθειαν Ἑρμᾶνοc δόcιν to *Iambus* 9 we have three extant lines of the poem. As is the case with *Iambus* 7, *Iambus* 9 is an elaboration on the tradition of dedicatory inscriptions, with, however, the speaker and addressee reversed. In *Iambus* 7 the statue of Hermes speaks; in *Iambus* 9 the statue of Hermes is addressed. The appearance of Hermes as central figure in two of the poems of the collection[60] is indicative of his prominent position in the iambic tradition overall.[61] Callimachus has brought many of the divine figures of elevated poetry into his *Iambi;* indeed, this is one respect in which he has at once greatly

58. On the suggestion that Philippus, this epigram's purported addressee, is in fact a doctor, see Gow-Page *H.E.* vol. 2, 157.

59. The term is that of M. Burzachechi, "Oggetti Parlanti nelle Epigrafi Greche," *Epigraphica* 24 (1962): 3–54. See also D. T. Steiner, "Pindar's 'Oggetti Parlanti,'" *HSCP* 95 (1993): 159–80 and "Moving Images: Fifth-Century Victory Monuments and the Athlete's Allure," *CA* 17, 1 (1998): 123–49.

60. Or at least two (*Iambi* 7 and 9). The possibility that Hermes is one of the missing figures among the assembly of gods in *Iambus* 12 cannot be excluded.

61. Hermes is a recurrent figure in Hipponax; cf. frr. 3 W. (1 Deg.), 3a.1 W. (2 Deg.), 32.1 W. (42 Deg.), 35 W. (10 Deg.), perh. 47.2 W. (51 Deg.), 79.9 W. (79 Deg.), 177 W. (208 Deg.). See West (1974) 144.

transcended and refashioned the defining lines of the genre. Hermes, however, is very much part of the tradition of iambic poetry, and is a mirror image in less elevated verse of the Apollo of elevated song.

The ithyphallic Hermes here evokes another aspect of the iambic tradition, and one which is selectively overlooked in many interpretations of Callimachus' *Iambi*—the graphically sexual or obscene. In an earlier era this was thought to be a Callimachean improvement on Hipponax.[62] In fact the *Iambi* exhibit a varied wealth of sexual and obscene expression, if of a different tone and effect than that of Hipponax: *Iambus* 1.98 κυcω, apparently "to the ass," the concluding lines of *Iambus* 3, *Iambus* 5.67 φιμόν [muzzle]. Yet while there is obscene language and imagery elsewhere in the *Iambi,* in *Iambus* 9 there is thematic context as well.

The question that the passing *erastes* addresses to the statue arises from two "sources" in confluence. One is a convention of dialogues with statues of Hermes particularly well attested in Attic comedy.[63] The other is Callimachus' constant interest in and varied use of *aitia*. *Iambus* 9 is both an elaboration on the *aition* as form, and on iambic invective of sexual behavior. The poem opens with direct speech from a speaker who is not the poet, something of a trick on the audience (cf. Persius 1.1). The Diegesis reveals both that the use of *aition* worked on two levels, and that the poem in fact turned to invective.

Hermes is one of the tutelary gods of the gymnasium and palaestra.[64] His statue in a wrestling school is a conventional one in this context, a context that has frequent homoerotic associations.[65] The conceit that Hermes' ithyphallic state is due to the beauty of one of the youths that frequents the palaestra is one that is found elsewhere in Hellenistic literature. Callimachus by sleight of hand here introduces another, unexpected, reason for the statue's erect member. Not sexual arousal at the sight of a beautiful youth but rather a cause associated with the distant origin of his cult is the cause of the god's condition; the horny god turns pedantic. The Tyrrhenian origin and μυcτικὸc λόγοc to which the statue refers in the summary of the diegete are both

62. See generally e.g. F. Jung (1929) 24, more recently P. M. Fraser (1972) 733–34. Clayman (1980) 58–59 is rather more cautious here.

63. See Kassel (1983) 1–12, and Dover to Aristophanes *Clouds* 1478.

64. Cf. Lucian *Dial. deorum* 25 (26), 2 σὺ δὲ παλαίειν διδάσκεις παιδοτρίβης ἄριστος ὤν [and you teach wrestling, as you are the best trainer.]

65. Cf. e.g. the opening scene of Plato's *Charmides;* Cat. 63.64 *ego gymnasi fui flos, ego eram decus olei* [I was the flower of the gymnasium, I was the grace of the olive flask]; Chariton 1.1.10. Cf. also Callim. frr. 68 and 69 (of Acontius), *Ep.* 41 Pf. (4 G.-P.), esp. the term στρέφεται in line 6, which may be something of a *double entendre* (the term is also used in wrestling). On public homoerotic settings see Buffière (1994) liv–lv.

recorded by Herodotus in connection with the rites of the Cabiri at Samothrace.[66] We have also an attestation from Varro that suggests Callimachus' interest in Samothrace.[67] The erotic response that the passing *erastes* anticipates becomes rather didactic, indeed hieratic. Whereas the statue's aroused state turns out to have a more noble origin, the arousal of the *erastes* the statue now declares to have an ignoble one. The summary comment of the diegete, ἐπὶ κακῷ δὲ αὐτὸν φιλεῖν τὸν | Φιλητάδαν [and further that he loves Philetades to bad purpose], indicates that the didactic aspect of the poem turned to a depiction of the erotic interest not of Hermes but of the *erastes*. If fr. 221 Pf.

αἰτοῦμεν εὐμάθειαν Ἑρμᾶνος δόσιν

we ask for facility in learning, the gift of Hermes

belongs to *Iambus* 9, as seems rather likely, the aspect of the didactic may well have been much more foregrounded in the poem, befitting one which has a wrestling school as its setting.

An anonymous epigram (*Ep. anon.* 14 G.-P., *A.P.* 12.143) bears a remarkable and enlightening resemblance to *Iambus* 9.

†Ἑρμῇ τοξευθεὶς ἐξέσπασε πικρὸν ἐφήβω†
κηγὼ τὴν αὐτήν, ξεῖνε, λέλογχα τύχην·
ἀλλά μ' Ἀπολλοφάνους τρύχει πόθος. ὦ φιλάεθλε
ἔφθασας· εἰς ἓν πῦρ οἱ δύ' ἐνηλάμεθα.

66. Hdt. 2.51 τοῦ δὲ Ἑρμέω τὰ ἀγάλματα ὀρθὰ ἔχειν τὰ αἰδοῖα ποιεῦντες οὐκ ἀπ' Αἰγυπτίων μεμαθήκασι, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ Πελασγῶν πρῶτοι μὲν Ἑλλήνων ἁπάντων Ἀθηναῖοι παραλαβόντες, παρὰ δὲ τούτων ὦλλοι . . . ὅστις δὲ τὰ Καβείρων ὄργια μεμύηται, τὰ Σαμοθρήικες ἐπιτελέουσι παραλαβόντες παρὰ Πελασγῶν, οὗτος ὠνὴρ οἶδε τὸ λέγω . . . Οἱ δὲ Πελασγοὶ ἱρόν τινα λόγον περὶ αὐτοῦ ἔλεξαν, τὰ ἐν τοῖσι ἐν Σαμοθρηίκῃ μυστηρίοισι δεδήλωται [Making statues of Hermes with erect members they learned not from the Egyptians, but from the Pelasgians, the Athenians first taking this up and then from them all the Greeks. . . . Whoever had been initiated in the rites of the Cabiri, which the Samothracians practice taking them from the Pelasgians, this man understands to what I refer. . . . The Pelasgians told a certain sacred story about this, which is revealed in the Samothracian mysteries.] The association of the Tyrrhenians with the Pelasgians is one that Callimachus develops in *Aetia* 4; see fr. 93 Pf. and Dieg. III 14, fr. 97 Pf. (*Moenia Pelasgica*) Τυρϲηνῶν τείχιϲμα Πελαϲγικὸν εἶχέ με γαῖα and Dieg. IV 1–4. Cf. also *Iambus* 12.31 Τυρϲην . [. I have argued (above ch. 3) that the god represented here may be Dionysus, but Hermes would certainly be another possible candidate.

67. Varro *Ling. Lat.* 7.34 p. 103, 8 Goetz-Schoell *hinc Casmilus (casmillus codd.) nominatur Samothrece<s> mysteris dius quidam amminister diis magnis. verbum esse graecum arbitror, quod apud Callimachum in poematibus eius inveni* (Pf. fr. 723); [hence is named Casmilus (casmillus codd.) a certain divine minister of the great divine mysteries of Samothrace. I think the word is Greek, as I found it in Callimachus among his poems.] The poem in question may have been *Iambus* 9.

Hermes, struck by an ephebe I have drawn a bitter wound[68]
and I, friend, have obtained the same fate.
But desire for Apollophanes wears me out.
Sport-lover, you are ahead of me. We two are cast into one fire.

The epigram is apparently a dialogue, and for this reason of a special interest when compared with *Iambus* 9. Although this epigram is itself unusual in the twelfth book of the Anthology (although statuary is not), it seems likely that the epigram is the more typical of erotic poems which involve the ithyphallic statue of Hermes, and that Callimachus has strikingly varied this convention by having the reason for the statue's physical state be something quite different from immediate lust and by turning the poem to fault the erotic desires of the *erastes* who first questions the statue.

Iambus 9 is, with *Iambi* 3 and 5, a poem which faults sexual behavior in a homoerotic setting. It has been suggested that the figure of the *erastes* is meant to be the poet himself, and thus like *Iambus* 3 this poem would be an erotic narrative with a clearly "autobiographical" cast. This interpretive approach to *Iambus* 9 overlooks the traditions of the *persona loquens* of iambic verse and the anonymous viewer of epigram.[69] More striking is the image of the statue, the object viewed, which itself observes human behavior.[70] In this respect *Iambus* 9, the last of the statuary poems, is in and of itself a striking contrast to *Iambus* 6. In the earlier poem the poet "views" the statue in his verse; in *Iambus* 9 the statue views the inner emotions of the man who at the poem's beginning views the statue. The ithyphallic statue of Hermes assumes the character of iambic poetry—didactic, censorious, critical of sexual behavior. The god of iambic becomes the iambic voice.

68. The first line of this epigram is corrupt. My translation follows Buffière (1994) 51 in accepting Beckby's conjecture ἐξέσπασα. See Buffière ibid. 120, and further on the epigram Kassel (1983) 10.

69. It should be noted in this regard that the Diegesis, usually quick to identify biographical figures in the *Iambi,* does not do so in this instance. Whether the speaker of the composition was specifically characterized as an *erastes* in the text of the poem or whether this is the deduction of the diegete must remain an open question. See D'Alessio (1996) 630, n. 1.

70. Cf. [Theocr.] *Id.* 23, and Athen. 13.561d on statues of Eros in gymnasia.

This page intentionally left blank

Select Bibliography

Adam, A., ed. 1966. *Fables de La Fontaine.* Paris: Garnier-Flammarion.

Albert, W. 1988. *Das mimetische Gedicht in der Antike.* Frankfurt am Main: Athenäums Monografien. (Altertumswissenschaft Bd. 190).

Ardizzoni, A. 1960. "Callimaco Ipponatteo." *AFLC* 28: 7–20.

———. 1980. "Riflessioni sul primo Giambo di Callimaco." *GIF* 11: 145–55.

Argetsinger, K. 1992. "Birthday Rituals: Friends and Patrons in Roman Poetry and Cult." *CA* 11, 2: 175–93.

Arnim, H. von. 1910. "Zum neuen Kallimachos." *Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akad.* 164, Abh. 4: 1–26.

Arnott, W. G. ed., 1996. *Alexis, The Fragments.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Aubreton, R., F. Buffière, and J. Irgoin, eds. 1994. *Anthologie grecque: Anthologie Palatine.* Vol. 11. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Bakhtin, M. M. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin.* Translated by C. Emerson and M. Holquist, edited by M. Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.

———. 1986. *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays.* Translated by V. W. McGee, edited by C. Emerson and M. Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Barber, E. A. 1939. "Notes on the Diegesis of Callimachus." *CQ* 33: 65–68.

———. 1951a. "The Fragments of Callimachus." Review of R. Pfeiffer, *Callimachus,* vol. 1. *Fragmenta. CR,* n.s., 1: 78–80.

———. 1951b. "Oxyrhynchus Papyri." Review of *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri,* pt. 19, eds. E. Lobel, E. P. Wegener, C. H. Roberts, and H. I. Bell. *CR,* n.s., 1: 80–82.

———. 1955. "Callimachea Varia." *CR,* n.s., 5: 241–42.

Barchiesi, A. 1996. "Poetry, Praise, and Patronage: Simonides in Book IV of Horace's *Odes.*" *CA* 15: 5–47.

Barrett, W. S., ed. 1964. *Euripides, Hippolytus.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bartoletti, V. 1933. "Die Allegorie des Feuers in den 'Iamben' des Kallimachos." *Kallimachos.* Edited by A. D. Skiadas. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft. Pp. 153–59. First published as "L'allegoria del fuoco nei 'Giambi' di Calimaco." *SIFC,* n.s., 10: 223–29.

Bergson, L. 1986. "Kallimachos, Iambos I (Fr. 191 Pf.), 26–28." *Eranos* 84: 11–16.

Bing, P. 1981. "The Voice of Those Who Live in the Sea: Empedocles and Callimachus." *ZPE* 41: 33–36.

———. 1988. *The Well-Read Muse: Present and Past in Callimachus and the Hellenistic Poets.* Hypomnemata 90. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
———. 1993. "The *Bios*-Tradition and Poets' Lives in Hellenistic Poetry." *Nomodeiktes: Greek Studies in Honor of Martin Ostwald.* Edited by R. M. Rosen and J. Farrell. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. Pp. 619–31.
———. 1995. "Ergänzungsspiel in the Epigrams of Callimachus." *A & A* 41: 115–31.
Bing, P. and R. Cohen. 1991. *Games of Venus: An Anthology of Greek and Roman Erotic Verse from Sappho to Ovid.* New York: Routledge.
Bing, P. and V. Uhrmeister. 1994. "The Unity of Callimachus' Hymn to Artemis." *JHS* 114: 19–34.
Blumenthal, A. v., ed. 1939. *Ion von Chios: Die Reste seiner Werke.* Stuttgart and Berlin: W. Kohlhammer Verlag.
Bond, G. W., ed. 1981. *Euripides, Heracles.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Booth, A. D. 1981. "Some Suspect Schoolmasters." *Florilegium* 3: 1–20.
Bornmann, F., ed. 1968. *Callimachi Hymnus in Dianam.* Florence: "La Nuova Italia" Editrice.
Bousquet, J. 1948[1949]. "Callimaque, Hérodote, et le trône de l'Hermès de Samothrace." *RA,* 6th ser., vols. 29–30. (=*Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire offerts à Charles Picard I,* 105–31.)
Bowman, A. K. 1986. *Egypt after the Pharaohs, 332 B.C.–A.D. 642: From Alexander to the Arab Conquest.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
Brink, C. O. 1982. *Horace On Poetry: Epistles Book II: The Letters to Augustus and Florus.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Bühler, W. 1964. "Archilochos und Kallimachos." *Archiloque.* Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, 10. Geneva: Fondation Hardt. Pp. 225–47.
Bulloch, A. W. 1970. "A New Interpretation of a Fragment of Callimachus' *AETIA:* Antinoopolis Papyrus 113 Fr. I (b)." *CQ* 20: 269–76.
———. 1985. *Callimachus: The Fifth Hymn.* Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 26. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
———. 1992. "Difference and Dissonance in Hellenistic Poetry." *TAPA* 122: 331–334.
Bulloch, A. W., E. S. Gruen, A. A. Long, and A. Stewart, eds. 1993. *Images and Ideologies: Self-definition in the Hellenistic World.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
Burzachechi, M. 1962. "Oggetti parlanti nelle epigrafi greche." *Epigraphica* 24: 3–52.
Burkert, W. 1985. *Greek Religion.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
———. 1992. *The Orientalizing Revolution: Near Eastern Influence on Greek Culture in the Early Archaic Age.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Burnett, A. P. 1983. *Three Archaic Poets: Archilochus, Alcaeus, Sappho.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Burton, J. 1995 *Theocritus's Urban Mimes: Mobility, Gender, and Patronage.* Berkeley: University of California Press.
Cairns, F. 1979. *Tibullus: A Hellenistic Poet at Rome.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Cameron, A. 1992. "Genre and Style in Callimachus." *TAPA* 122: 305–12.
———. 1995. *Callimachus and His Critics.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Castrucci, V. 1996. "Elementi orientali nella letteratura ellenistica: Per una lettura di Callimaco, fr. 194 Pfeiffer." *QS* 43: 279–93.
Ceresa-Gastaldo, A., ed. 1979. *La Struttura della fabulazione antica.* Pubblicazioni dell'Istituto di Filologia Classica e Medievale 54. Genoa: Istituto di Filologia Classica e Medievale.
Clauss, J. J. 1986. "Lies and Allusions: The Addressee and Date of Callimachus' *Hymn to Zeus.*" *CA* 5, 2: 155–70.
Clayman, D. L. 1976. "Callimachus' Thirteenth Iamb: The Last Word." *Hermes* 104: 29–35.
———. 1978/79. "Callimachus' Fourth Iamb." *CJ* 74: 142–48.
———. 1980. *Callimachus' Iambi.* Mnemosyne Supplement 59. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
———. 1988. "Callimachus' *Iambi* and *Aitia.*" *ZPE* 74: 277–86.
Conte, G. B. 1994. *Genres and Readers.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Corbato, C. 1979. "La funzione delle 'fabulae' in Callimaco." In Ceresa-Gastaldo (1979), 45–64.
Courtney, E. 1988. "Callimachus *Iambus* II, Fr. 192." *ZPE* 74: 276.
Cozzoli, A. T. 1996. "Il I giambo e il nuovo ἰαμβίζειν di Callimaco." *Eikasmos* 7: 129–47.
Crusius, O. 1910. "Egypt Exploration Fund. The Oxyrhynchos Papyri. Part VII." Review of *The Oxyrhynchos Papyri,* pt. 7, ed. A. S. Hunt. Literarisches Zentralblatt Deutschlands 1910: 556–58.
Cunningham, I. C., ed. 1971. *Herodas Mimiambi.* Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.
D'Alessio, G. B. 1995. "Apollo Delio, i Cabiri Milesii e le Cavalle di Tracia. Osservazioni su Callimaco frr. 114–115 Pf." *ZPE* 106: 5–21.
———, ed. 1996. *Callimaco Inni Epigrammi Frammenti.* 2 vols. Milan: Biblioteca Universale Rizzoli.
———. 2000. "Le Argonautiche di Cleone Curiense." *Quaderni dei Seminari Romani di Cultura Greca* 1: 91–109.
Dawson, C. M. 1946. "An Alexandrian Prototype of Marathus?" *AJP* 67: 1–15.
———. 1950. "The *Iambi* of Callimachus: A Hellenistic Poet's Experimental Laboratory." *YCS* 11: 1–168.
Degani, E. 1984. *Studi su Ipponatte.* Studi e Commenti 2. Bari: Adriatica Editrice.
———. 1987a. *Dizionario degli Scrittori Graeci e Latini,* s.v. "Giambici (Poeti)." Milan: Marzorati.
———. 1987b. "Note sulla fortuna di Archiloco e di Ipponatte in epoca ellenistica." *QUCC* 16: 79–104.
———, ed. 1991. *Hipponactis testimonia et fragmenta.* 2d ed. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.
———. 1995. "Ipponatte e i poeti filologi." *Aevum Antiquum* 8: 105–36.
Denniston, J. D. 1934. *The Greek Particles.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Depew, M. 1992. "ἰαμβεῖον καλεῖται νῦν: Genre, Occasion, and Imitation in Callimachus, frr. 191 and 203 Pf." *TAPA* 122: 313–30.
———. 1993 "Mimesis and Aetiology in Callimachus' *Hymns.*" *Callimachus.* Hellenistica Groningana, 1. Edited by M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit, and G. C. Wakker. Groningen: Egbert Forsten. Pp. 57–77
Detienne, M. 1981. *Les maîtres de vérité dans la Grèce archaïque.* Paris: François Maspero.

Diels, H. 1910. "Orientalische Fabeln in griechischem Gewande." *Internationale Wochenschrift für Wissenschaft, Kunst und Technik* 4: 993–1002.
Dover, K. J. 1964. "The Poetry of Archilochus." *Archiloque.* Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, 10. Geneva: Fondation Hardt. Pp. 183–212.
———. 1971. *Theocritus: Select Poems.* London: Macmillan.
Dunbar, N., ed. 1995. *Aristophanes: Birds.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Falivene, M. R. 1993. "Callimaco serio-comico: il primo Giambo (fr. 191 Pf.)." *Tradizione e innovazione nella cultura greca da Omero all'età ellenistica: Scritti in onore di Bruno Gentili.* Edited by R. Pretagostini. Vol. 3 *Letteratura Ellenistica.* Rome: Gruppo Editoriale Internazionale. Pp. 911–25.
Fantuzzi, M. 1993a. "Preistoria di un genere letterario: a proposito degli Inni V e VI di Callimaco." *Tradizione e Innovazione nella Cultura Greca da Omero all'Età Ellenistica: Scritti in Onore di Bruno Gentili.* Edited by R. Pretagostini. Vol. 3 *Letteratura Ellenistica.* Rome: Gruppo Editoriale Internazionale. Pp. 927–46.
———. 1993b. "Il sistema letterario della poesia alessandrina nel III sec. A.C." *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica.* Edited by G. Cambiano, D. Canfora, and D. Lanza. Vol. 1.2: Rome: Salerno. Pp. 31–73.
Faust, M. 1970. "Die künstlerische Verwendung von ΚΥΩΝ 'Hund' in den homerischen Epen." *Glotta* 48: 8–31.
Fraenkel, E. 1942. "An Epodic Poem of Hipponax." *CQ* 36: 54–56. Reprinted in *Kleine Beiträge zur Klassischen Philologie.* Vol. 1. 241–45. Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1964.
Fraser, P. M. 1972. *Ptolemaic Alexandria.* 3 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Freudenburg, K. 1993. *The Walking Muse: Horace on the Theory of Satire.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Früchtel, L. 1950. "Zur Äsopfabel des Kallimachos." *Gymnasium* 57: 123–24.
Fuhrer, T. 1992. *Die Auseinandersetzung mit den Chorlyrikern in den Epinikien des Kallimachos.* Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 23. Basel/Kassel: Friedrich Reinhardt Verlag.
Gabathuler, M. 1937. *Hellenistische Epigramme auf Dichter.* St. Gallen.
Gasparri, C. 1982. "Archiloco a Taso." *QUCC,* n.s., 11: 33–41.
Gentili, B. 1988. *Poetry and Its Public in Ancient Greece: From Homer to the Fifth Century.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Gerhard, G. A., ed. 1909. *Phoinix von Kolophon: Texte und Untersuchungen.* Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.
Giangrande, G. 1969. "Callimachus, Poetry and Love." *Eranos* 67: 33–42.
———. 1972. "Callimaque et l'Écho." *Eranos* 70: 87–90.
Goldhill, S. 1991. *The Poet's Voice: Essays on Poetics and Greek Literature.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Gow, A. S. F., ed. 1950. *Theocritus.* 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Gow, A. S. F., and D. L. Page, eds. *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams.* 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Green, P. 1990. *Alexander to Actium: The Historical Evolution of the Hellenistic Age.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
Griffith, M. 1983. "Personality in Hesiod." *CA* 2, 1: 37–65.
———. 1990. "Contest and Contradiction in Early Greek Poetry." *Cabinet of the Muses: Essays on Classical and Comparative Literature in Honor of Thomas G.*

Rosenmeyer. Edited by M. Griffith and D. J. Mastronarde. Atlanta: Scholars Press. Pp. 185–207.
Griffiths, F. T. 1979. *Theocritus at Court*. Mnemosyne Supplement 55. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
Gutzwiller, K. J. 1996. "The Evidence for Theocritean Poetry Books." *Theocritus*. Hellenistica Groningana, 2. Edited by M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit, and G. C. Wakker. Groningen: Egbert Forsten. Pp. 119–48.
———. 1998. *Poetic Garlands: Hellenistic Epigrams in Context*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
Hammerstaedt, J., ed. 1988. *Die Orakelkritik des Kynikers Oenomaus*. Beiträge zur Klassischen Philologie 188. Frankfurt am Main: Athenäum.
Harder, M. A., R. F. Regtuit, and G. C. Wakker, eds. 1993. *Callimachus*. Hellenistica Groningana, 1. Groningen: Egbert Forsten.
———. 1996. *Theocritus*. Hellenistica Groningana, 2. Groningen: Egbert Forsten.
———. 1998. *Genre in Hellenistic Poetry*. Hellenistica Groningana, 3. Groningen: Egbert Forsten.
Hausrath, A. 1949. "Ζεὺς καὶ τὰ θηρία: Die unbekannte Äsopfabel im Iambenbuch des Kallimachos (fr. 87 Schn. v. fr. 9, 160–173 Pf.)" *Gymnasium* 56: 48–58.
———, ed. 1962. *Corpus Fabularum Aesopicarum*. 2 vols. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.
Headlam, W., and A. D. Knox, eds. 1922. *Herodas, The Mimes and Fragments*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Henderson, J. 1991. *The Maculate Muse: Obscene Language in Attic Comedy*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
Herter, H. 1937. "Kallimachos." *Bursians Jahresbericht* 255: 82–218.
———. 1954. Review of R. Pfeiffer, *Callimachus*. *Gnomon* 26:74–80.
Hinds, S. 1998. *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Hollis, A. S., ed. 1990. *Callimachus: Hecale*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Hopkinson, N., ed. 1984. *Callimachus: Hymn to Demeter*. Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 27. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
———, ed. 1988. *A Hellenistic Anthology*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univeristy Press.
———, ed. 1994. *Greek Poetry of the Imperial Period: An Anthology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Hughes, B. 1996. "Callimachus, Hipponax, and the Persona of the Iambographer." *MD* 37: 205–16.
Hunter, R. 1996. *Theocritus and the Archaeology of Greek Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
———. 1997. "(B)ionic man: Callimachus' iambic programme." *PCPS* 43: 41–52.
Hutchinson, G. O. 1988. *Hellenistic Poetry*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Huxley, G. 1965. "Ion of Chios." *GRBS* 6: 29–46.
Jedrkiewicz, S. 1989. *Sapere e Paradosso nell'Antichità: Esopo e la Favola*. Rome: Edizioni dell' Ateneo.
Jung, F. 1929. "Hipponax redivivus." Ph.D. diss., Giessen.
Kahn, L. 1978. *Hermès passe ou les ambiguïtés de la communication*. Paris: François Maspero.
Kambylis, A. 1965. *Die Dichterweihe und ihre Symbolik: Untersuchungen zu Hesiodos, Kallimachos, Properz, und Ennius*. Bibliothek der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft N.F. 2d ser., vol. 5. Heidelberg: Carl Winter-Universitätsverlag.

Kapsomenos, S. G. 1937. "Συμβολὴ εἰς τὴν ἑρμηνείαν τοῦ δευτέρου Ἰάμβου τοῦ Καλλιμάχου." *Athena* 47: 28–36.
———. 1939/40. "Zum Papyrus der Διηγήσεις zu Gedichten des Kallimachos." *ByzJ* 16: 1–32.
Kassel, R. 1958. "Kleinigkeiten zu den Kallimachos-Fragmenten." *Rh.M.* 101: 235–38.
Klein, T. M. 1980. "Myth, Song, and Theft in the Homeric *Hymn to Hermes*." *Classical Mythology in Twentieth-Century Thought and Literature.* Proceedings of the Comparative Literature Symposium Texas Tech University 11. Lubbock: Texas Tech Press. Pp. 125–44.
———. 1974. "The Role of Callimachus in the Development of the Concept of the Counter-Genre: Callimachus and the Cynic παραχαράττειν τὸ νόμισμα." *Latomus* 33, 2: 217–31.
Klingner, F. 1982. *Q. Horatius Flaccus Opera.* Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.
Knight, T. E. 1988. "ἡ καθαρὴ λιβάς: A Study of the Programmatic Unity of the Callimachean Hymns." Ph.D. diss., Berkeley. University of California, Berkeley.
Knox, A. D. 1925/26. "Herodas and Callimachus." *Philologus* 81: 241–55.
Knox, P. E. 1985. "The Epilogue to the *Aetia*." *GRBS* 26: 59–65.
Koenen, L. 1983. "Die Adaption ägyptischer Königsideologie am Ptolemäerhof." *Egypt and the Hellenistic World.* Studia Hellenistica 27. Edited by E. van't Dack, P. van Dessel, and W. van Gucht. Louvain. Pp. 143–90.
———. 1993. "The Ptolemaic King as a Religious Figure." *Images and Ideologies: Self-Definition in the Hellenistic World.* Edited by A. W. Bulloch, E. S. Gruen, A. A. Long and A. Stewart. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. Pp. 25–115.
Konstan, D. 1998. "The Dynamics of Imitation: Callimachus' First Iambic." *Genre in Hellenistic Poetry.* Hellenistica Groningana, 3. Edited by M. A. Harder, R. F. Retguit, and G. C. Wakker. Groningen: Egbert Forsten. Pp. 133–42.
Kontoleon, N. M. 1965. "'Αρχαικὴ ζῳφόρος ἐκ Πάρου." *Charisterion Orlandos.* 1: 348–418. Athens.
Krevans, N. 1993. "Fighting Against Antimachus: the *Lyde* and the *Aetia* Reconsidered." *Callimachus.* Hellenistica Groningana, 1. Edited by M. A. Harder, R. F. Retguit, and G. C. Wakker. Groningen: Egbert Forsten. Pp. 149–60.
Kroll, J. 1963. "Das Gottesbild aus dem Wasser." *Märchen, Mythos, Dichtung: Festschr. F. von der Leyens.* Munich: C. H. Beck. Pp. 251–68.
Kuch, H. 1965. ΦΙΛΟΛΟΓΟΣ: *Untersuchung eines Wortes von seinem ersten Auftreten in der Tradition bis zur ersten überlieferten lexikalischen Festlegung.* Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Schriften der Sektion Für Altertumswissenschaft 48. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
Kurke, L. V. 1988. "The Poet's Pentathalon: Genre in Pindar's First Isthmian." *GRBS* 29: 97–113.
———. 1991. *The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
Lambert, W. G. 1960. *Babylonian Wisdom Literature.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Lanata, G., ed. 1963. *Poetica Pre-Platonica: Testimonianze e Frammenti.* Florence: "La Nuova Italia" Editrice.

La Penna, A. 1964. "Letteratura esopica e letteratura assiro-babilonese." *RFIC* 92: 24–39.
Lasserre, F. 1950. *Les épodes d'Archiloque.* Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
Lefkowitz, M. R. 1963. "ΤΩ ΚΑΙ ΕΓΩ": The First Person in Pindar." *HSCP* 67: 177–253.
———. 1976. "Fictions in Literary Biography: The New Poem and the Archilochus Legend." *Arethusa* 9, 2: 181–89.
Legrand, Ph.-E. 1901. "Problèmes alexandrins I: Pourquoi furent composés les *hymnes* de Callimaque?" *REA* 3: 281–312.
Lehnus, L., ed. 1989. *Bibliografia Callimachea, 1489–1988.* Pubblicazioni del Dipartimento di Archeologia, Filologia Classica e loro Tradizioni, n.s. 123. Genoa.
Lelli, E. 1996. "La figure del rovo nel *Giambo* IV di Callimaco." *Riv. Cult. Class. Med.* 38: 311–18.
Leurini, L. 1992. *Ionis Chii Testimonia et Fragmenta.* Classical and Byzantine Monographs 23. Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert.
———. 1997. "Callimaco, fr. 194, 36 Pf." *QUCC* 55, 1: 107–9.
Lichtheim, M. 1980. *Ancient Egyptian Literature,* vol. 3, *The Late Period.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
Livrea, E. and G.A. Privitera, eds. 1978. *Studi in onore di Anthos Ardizzoni.* Rome: Edizioni dell' Ateneo & Bizzarri.
Luck, G. 1959. "Kids and Wolves (An Interpretation of Callimachus, fr. 202.69-70 Pf.)." *CQ* n.s. 9: 34–37.
Maas, P. 1934. "In Callimachi Iambos (v. 292 Pfeiffer)." *SIFC* n.s. 11: 97.
MacDowell, D. M., ed. 1971. *Aristophanes: Wasps.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Maehler, H. 1983. "Die griechische Schule im ptolemäischen Ägypten." *Egypt and the Hellenistic World.* Studia Hellenistica, 27. Edited by E. van't Dack, P. van Dessel, and W. van Gucht. Louvain. Pp. 191–203.
Marinone, N. 1984. *Berenice da Callimaco a Catullo.* Roma: Edizioni dell'Ateneo & Bizzarri.
Martin, R. 1992. "Hesiod's Metanastic Poetics." *Ramus* 21, 1: 11–33.
———. 1993. "The Seven Sages as Performers of Wisdom." *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece: Cult, Performance, Politics.* Edited by C. Dougherty and L. Kurke. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Pp. 108–28.
Masson, O. 1962. *Les fragments du poète Hipponax.* Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck.
Mastromarco, G. 1984. *The Public of Herondas.* London Studies in Classical Philology 11. Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben.
May, J. M. F. 1950. *Ainos: Its History and Coinage, 474–341. B.C.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Meillier, C. 1979a. *Callimaque et son temps: Recherches sur la carrière et la condition d'un écrivain à l'époque des premiers Lagides.* Publication de l'Université de Lille 3.
———. 1979b. "Callimaque, *Aitia,* fr. 1, v. 7, et l'unité probable des fragments 1 (invective) et 2 (songe)." *ZPE* 33: 39–40.
Merkelbach, R. 1956. "Literarische Texte unter Ausschluss der Christlichen." *APF* 16, 1: 82–129.
Mineur, W. H. 1984. *Callimachus: Hymn to Delos.* Mnemosyne Supplement 83. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Miralles, C., and J. Pòrtulas. *Archilochus and the Iambic Poetry.* Rome: Edizioni dell' Ateneo & Bizzarri.
Nagy, G. 1976. "Iambos: Typologies of Invective and Praise." *Arethusa* 9, 2: 191–205.
———. 1979. *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
———. 1989. "Language and Meaning in Archaic and Classical Greece." *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism.* Vol. 1 *Classical Criticism.* Edited by G. A. Kennedy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Pp. 1–77.
Nikitinski, O. 1996. *Kallimachos-Studien.* Frankfurt am Main: P. Lang.
Norsa, M., and G. Vitelli, eds. 1934. *Διηγήσεις di poemi di Callimaco in un papiro di Tebtynis.* Florence: Tipografia Enrico Ariani.
Paduano Faedo, L. 1970. "L'inversione del rapporto poeta: Musa nella cultura ellenistica." *ASNP,* 2d ser., vol. 39, no 3–4: 377–86
Page, D. L., ed. 1941. *Select Papyri: Literary Papyri: Poetry.* Loeb Classical Library 360. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Parsons, P. J. 1977. "Callimachus: Victoria Berenices." *ZPE* 25: 1–50.
Perry, B. E., ed. 1952. *Aesopica.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
———. 1962. "Demetrius of Phalerum and Aesopic Fables." *TAPA* 93: 287–346.
Pfeiffer, R. 1922. *Kallimachosstudien.* Munich: Max Heuber.
———. 1928. "Ein neues Altersgedicht des Kallimachos." *Hermes* 63: 302–41. Reprinted in Pfeiffer 1960, 98–132.
———. 1941. "The Measurements of the Zeus at Olympia: New Evidence from an Epode of Callimachus." *JHS* 61: 1–5. Reprinted in Pfeiffer 1960, 71–79.
———, ed. 1949–1953. *Callimachus.* 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
———. 1952. "The Image of the Delian Apollo and Apolline Ethics." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 25: 20–32. Reprinted in Pfeiffer 1960, 55–71.
———. 1960. *Ausgewählte Schriften.* Edited by Winfried Bühler. Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
———. 1968. *History of Classical Scholarship: From the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Picard, C. 1942. "Le sculpteur Épeios: Du cheval de Troie au taureau de Phalaris." *RN,* 5th ser. 6: 1–22.
Powell, J. U., ed. 1925. *Collectanea Alexandrina.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Prins, Y. 1999. *Victorian Sappho.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Pritchett, W. K. 1993. *The Liar School of Herodotus.* Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben.
Puelma Piwonka, M. 1949. *Lucilius und Kallimachos: Zur Geschichte einer Gattung der hellenistisch-römischen Poesie.* Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann.
Rabinowitz, P. 1986. "Shifting Stands, Shifting Standards: Reading, Interpretation, and Literary Judgment." *Arethusa* 19.2: 115–31.
Reed, J. D. 1995. "The Sexuality of Adonis." *CA* 14, 2: 317–47.
———. 1997. *Bion of Smyrna: The Fragments and the Adonis.* Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 33. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Rees, B. R. 1961. "Callimachus, *Iambus* I.9–11." *CR* 11: 1–3.
Reinsch-Werner, H. 1976. *Callimachus Hesiodicus: Die Rezeption der hesiodischen Dichtung durch Kallimachos von Kyrene.* Berlin: Verlag Nikolaus Mielke.
Richardson, N. J., ed. 1974. *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Romm, J. 1998. *Herodotus.* New Haven: Yale University Press.
Rösler, W. 1985. "Persona reale o persona poetica? L'interpretazione dell''io' nella lirica greca arcaica." *QUCC,* n.s., 19, 1: 131–44.
———. 1986. "Michail Bachtin und die Karnevalskultur im antiken Griechenland." *QUCC,* n.s., 23.2: 25–44.
Rosen, R. M. 1988. *Old Comedy and the Iambographic Tradition.* American Classical Studies 19. Atlanta: Scholars' Press.
Rosenmeyer, T. G. 1985. "Ancient Literary Genres: A Mirage?" *The Yearbook of Comparative and General Literature* 34: 74–84.
Rossi, L. E. 1971. "I generi letterari e le loro leggi scritte e non scritte nelle letterature classiche." *BICS* 18: 69–94.
Rostagni, A. 1963. *Miscellanea di Studi Alessandrini in memoria di Augusto Rostagni.* Turin: Bottega d'Erasmo.
Roussel, L. 1929. *Callimaque: Hymne à Zeus.* Montpellier.
Ruijgh, C. J. 1984. "Le dorien de Théocrite: Dialecte cyrénien d'Alexandrie et d'Égypte." *Mnemosyne* ser. 4 v. 33 fasc. 1–2:56–88.
Russell, D. A. and N. G. Wilson, eds. 1981. *Menander Rhetor.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Schwarzbaum, H. 1979. *The Mishle Shu'alim (Fox Fables) of Rabbi Berechiah Ha-Nakdan: A Study in Comparative Folklore and Fable Lore.* Kiron: Institute for Jewish and Arab Folklore Research.
Scodel, R. 1987. "Horace, Lucilius, and Callimachean Polemic." *HSCP* 91: 199–215.
Seidensticker, B. 1982. *Palintonos Harmonia: Studien zu komischen Elementen in der griechischen Tragödie.* Hypomnemata 72. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
Seiler, M. A. 1997. ΠΟΙΗΣΙΣ ΠΟΙΗΣΕΩΣ: *Alexandrinische Dichtung* ΚΑΤΑ ΛΕΠΤΟΝ *in strukturaler und humanethologischer Deutung.* Stuttgart: Teubner.
Selden, D. 1998. "Alibis." *CA* 17, 2: 289–412.
Serrao, G. 1978. "La Genesi del 'Poeta Doctus' e le Aspirazioni Realistiche nella Poetica del Primo Ellenismo." *Studi in onore di Anthos Ardizzoni.* Edited by E. Livrea and G. A. Privitera. Rome: Edizioni dell' Ateneo & Bizzarri. Pp. 909–48.
Skiadas, A. D., ed. 1975. *Kallimachos.* W.d.F. 296. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
Snell, B., ed. 1971–. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
Soverini, L. 1992. "Parole, voce, gesto del commerciante nella Grecia Classica." *ASNP* 3d ser. 22, 3: 811–84.
Stallybrass, P., and A. White. 1986. *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
Steiner, D. T. 1986. *The Crown of Song: Metaphor in Pindar.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
———. 1993. "Pindar's 'Oggetti Parlanti." *HSCP* 95: 159–80.
———. 1998. "Moving Images: Fifth-Century Victory Monuments and the Athlete's Allure." *CA* 17.1: 123–49.
Stephens, S. A. 2003. *Seeing Double: The Politics of Poetry in Ptolemaic Alexandria.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
Suleiman, S. R. 1980. *The Reader in the Text: Essays on Audience and Interpretation.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Svenbro, J. 1976. *La parole et le marbre: aux origines de la poétique grecque.* Lund: J. Svenbro.
Tarditi, G. 1978. "Le muse povere (Call. *Ia.* I, fr. 191, 92–93 Pf.)." *Studi in onore di Anthos Ardizzoni.* Edited by E. Livrea and G. A. Privitera. Rome: Edizioni dell' Ateneo & Bizzarri. Pp. 1015–21.
Thomas, R. F. 1979. "New Comedy, Callimachus, and Roman Poetry." *HSCP* 83: 179–206.
Treu, M., ed. 1959. *Archilochus.* Munich: E. Heimeran.
Trypanis, C. A., ed. 1958. Callimachus, *Fragments.* Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Van 'T Dack, E., P. van Dessel, and W. van Gucht, eds. 1983. *Egypt and the Hellenistic World.* Proceedings of the International Colloquium Leuven: 24–26 May 1982 = Studia Hellenistica 27.
Visser, C. E. 1938. *Götter und Kulte im Ptolemäischen Alexandrien.* Amsterdam: N. V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgeversmaatschappij.
Vox, O. 1995. "Sul Giambo I di Callimaco." *Rudiae* 7: 275–87.
Waites, M. C. 1912. "Some Features of the Allegorical Debate in Greek Literature." *HSCP* 23: 1–46.
Walsh, G. B. 1990. "Surprised by Self: Audible Thought in Hellenistic Poetry." *CP* 85: 1–21.
———. 1991. "Callimachean Passages: The Rhetoric of Epitaph in Epigram." *Arethusa* 24: 77–103.
Waszink, J. H. 1974. "Biene und Honig als Symbol des Dichters und Dichtung in der griechischen-römischen Antike," *Rheinisch-Westfälische Akademie der Wissenschaften,* Vorträge G. Opladen.
Weber, G. 1993. *Dichtung und höfische Gesellschaft: Die Rezeption von Zeitgeschichte am Hof der ersten drei Ptolemäer.* Hermes Einzelschriften 62. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.
West, M. L. 1966. *Hesiod: Theogony.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
———. 1969. "Near Eastern Material in Hellenistic and Roman Literature." *HSCP* 73: 113–34.
———. 1971. "Callimachus on the Pythagoreans." *CR* 21: 330–31.
———, ed. 1971–72. *Iambi et Elegi Graeci Ante Alexandrum Cantati.* 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2nd ed. 1989–92.
———. 1974. *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus.* Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 14. Berlin: de Gruyter.
———. 1978. *Hesiod: Works and Days.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
———. 1997. *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
White, S. A. 1994. "Callimachus on Plato and Cleombrotus." *TAPA* 124: 135–61.
———. 1999. "Callimachus and the Seven Sages." (forthcoming)
Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. v., ed. 1895. *Euripides, Herakles.* Berlin. Repr. Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1959.
———. 1924. *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos.* 2 vols. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.
Wimmel, W. 1960. *Kallimachos in Rom: Die Nachfolge seines apologetischen Dichtens in der Augusteerzeit.* Hermes Einzelschriften 16. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Winkler, J.J. 1990. *The Constraints of Desire: The Anthropology of Sex and Gender in Ancient Greece.* New York: Routledge.
Zanker, G. 1987. *Realism in Alexandrian Poetry: A Literature and Its Audience.* London: Croom Helm.
Ziegler, K. 1934. *Das hellenistische Epos: ein vergessenes Kapitel griechischer Dichtung.* Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.

This page intentionally left blank

Index of Passages Cited

Note: cn. refers to a commentary note; n. refers to a footnote in the text.

Achilles Tatius
Leucippe and Cleitophon
4.19.5: 34n.11

Adespota Iambica
35.14 W.: 262

Aeschines
Against Timarchus
74: 258n.116
124: 258n.116

Aeschylus
Agamemnon
381–84: 139n.41
773–80: 139n.41
Choephoroe
107: 261n.128
Prometheus
478–81: 162cn.74
803: 110cn.58
1021–22: 110cn.58
Suppliants
741–42: 247n.73

Aesop
Fabulae
1 Haus. (1 Perry): 171n.9, 172n.11
195 Haus. (184 Perry): 174–75
228 Haus. (240 Perry): 177
233 Haus. (213 Perry): 197
420 Haus. (226 Perry): 291

Alcaeus of Messene
Ep. 13 G.P.: 35n.12

Alcaeus of Mytilene
fr. 74.6 V., *scholion*: 263–64

Alexis
PCG 103: 94n.61

Anacreontea
2.1–2 W.: 39n.26
9.3–6 W.: 54n.68

Ananius
fr. 1 W. (Hippon. 219 Sp. Deg.): 11

Anecdota Graeca
310 Cramer: 282n.9

Antipater of Sidon
6.159 *A.P.*(G.-P. 3): 129n.22

Apollonius Dyscolus
473 Pf.: 107cn.11

Apollonius of Rhodes
Argonautica
1.721–67: 294
3.247–48: 51n.63
3.448ff.: 51n.63
4.1309–11: 130n.24
Fragments
fr. 1 (Powell): 291
fr. 2 (Powell): 291

Aratus
Epigrams
11.437 *A.P.* (G.-P. 2): 261

Aratus *(continued)*
Phaenomena
1–4: 127n.18
96–136: 223n.11

Archilochus
25.5 W.: 262
30 W.: 281n.5
31 W.: 281n.5
48.5–6 W.: 280–81n.5
114 W.: 218
115.2 W.: 37n.16
119 W.: 258
122 W.: 281n.5
124.4–5 W.: 80n.26
[168.4] W.: 37n.16
172 W.: 171, 219
172–81 W.: 171, 253
174 W.: 171
177 W.: 171–72
196a. W. (*Cologne Epode*): 252
197 W.: 106
247 W.: 67cn.52
329 W.: 262

Aristophanes
Acharnians
104: 34n.11
165: 242n.57
Birds
470–75: 172–73n.12
Ecclesiazusae
284: 292n.38
Frogs
804: 204n.83
939–43: 58n.84
1058–62: 77n.17
1175: 242n.57
Knights
964: 34n.11
411–13: 57n.80
Lysistrata
393: 246n.71
1311: 246n.69
Peace
122–23: 57n.80
832–37: 91n.51
835–37a *schol.* 6–7: 88n.42
835–37a *schol.* 11–12: 86n.37
1067–68: 41n.30
1067–68 *schol.*: 41n.30
1200: 22cn.2
Wasps
253–54: 57n.80
443–44: 200n.77

Aristotle
Generation of Animals
719b22–23: 176
749b11–19: 176
Poetics
1448b24: 2n.3
1448b31–32: 257n.110
Rhetoric
1408b32–1409a1: 88n.43

Arrian
Indica
15.5–70: 140n.42

Artemidorus
Onirocritica
4.84: 232n.30

Athenaeus
Deipnosophistae
4.176d: 121
13.561d: 303n.70
14.656d: 229n.23

Babrius
Fabulae
Prol. 1.6–13: 176n.18
Prol. 1.10: 187
fr. 11: 291

Callimachus
Aetia
1, fr. 1: 42n.36, 44, 73, 76, 125, 139, 174–75, 226
1, fr. 1.1: 43, 175, 189
1, fr. 1.3–6: 102n.78
1, fr. 1.7: 76n.14, 187n.52
1, fr. 1.7–20: 43n.38
1, fr. 1.9–12: 40n.27
1, fr. 1.11: 72
1, fr. 1.17–18: 135
1, fr. 1.19–20: 189
1, fr. 1.21–22: 57n.81
1, fr. 1.21–23: 142
1, fr. 1.23–24: 67cn.60, 102, 231n.28
1, fr. 1.24: 102
1, fr. 1.25–26: 173n.12
1, fr. 1.25–28: 201
1, fr. 1.29–35: 43n.38
1, fr. 1.30: 188
1, fr. 1.35–38: 224
1, fr. 1.37–38: 96, 102n.78, 141n.46
1, fr. 1.39–40: 181

1, fr. 2: 97, 99, 232
1, fr. 2.1–2: 47n.52
1, fr. 26.11: 195n.69
1, fr. 37: 129–30n.23
2, fr. 43.84: 274cn.41
2, *SH* fr. 253: 232
3, fr. 64: 284, 286
3, fr. 67–75: 13, 124, 234, 249n.81
3, fr. 68–69: 235n.36, 301n.65
3, fr. 75: 53n.67, 199n.75
3, fr. 75.4–5: 188n.54
3, fr. 75.4–7: 293n.41
3, fr. 75.4–9: 52n.65, 243
3, fr. 75.6: 245
3, fr. 75.8: 68cn.34
3, fr. 75.9: 209cn.39
3, fr. 75.22–28: 186n.46
3, fr. 75.26–27: 240n.53
3, fr. 75.30–33: 240
3, fr. 75.30–37: 240n.52
3, fr. 75.75–77: 40n.27
3, fr. 75.76–77: 248n.76
3, fr. 80.16: 11
3, *SH* fr. 253.11 (Pf. 475): 129
3, *SH* fr. 254 (Pf. 383.16): 246n.70
3, *SH* frr. 254–68: 13, 124
3, *SH* fr. 254.2: 124n.11
4, frr. 86–89: 192
4, frr. 91–92: 299n.57
4, fr. 93: 302n.66
4, fr. 97: 302n.66
4, frr. 100–1: 286
4, fr. 110: 13, 123, 243, 249
4, fr. 110.47–50: 221n.8
4, fr. 110.54–56: 80n.25
4, fr. 110.77–78: 123n.10
4, fr. 112: 3, 12, 44, 47
4, fr. 112.2–3: 47n.51
4, fr. 112.5–6: 47n.52
4, fr. 112.9: 4, 40n.27, 44, 47n.50, 58n.84, 85
inc. lib., fr. 114: 285–86, 300
inc. lib., fr. 114.2–3: 116cn.60
inc. lib., fr. 176.5: 290n.35
inc. lib., fr. 186.8–10: 298n.54

Elegiaca Minora
fr. 380 (*Grapheion*): 188n.53
fr. 384.1–15 (*The Victory of Sosibius*): 109cn.29
fr. 384.6: 130n.23
fr. 384.14–15: 140
fr. 384.15: 111cn.64

Epigrams (Pfeiffer)
5 (G.-P. 14): 214, 286–87
5.7–9 (G.-P. 14): 80n.25
5.9 (G.-P. 14): 293n.41
8.3 (G.-P. 58): 80n.24
8.5 (G.-P. 58): 46n.47
13.5–6 (G.-P. 31): 22cn.2
23 (G.-P. 53): 86n.36
24 (G.-P. 60): 286n.24
25.3–4 (G.-P. 11): 244
27 (G.-P. 56): 97n.67
27.1 (G.-P. 56): 99
28 (G.-P. 2): 42n.36, 43, 232
28.5–6 (G.-P. 2): 189n.58
30 (G.-P. 12): 242, 245
32 (G.-P. 7): 249–50
35 (G.-P. 20): 79n.23
37.3–5 (G.-P. 17): 45n.43
40 (G.-P. 48): 293–94n.43
40.6 (G.-P. 48): 293
41 (G.-P. 4): 250, 301n.65
41.1–2 (G.-P. 4): 80n.25
46.1–2 (G.-P. 3): 78
46.3–6 (G.-P. 3): 248
46.9–10 (G.-P. 3): 300
47 (G.-P. 28): 184
48 (G.-P. 26): 259
48.1 (G.-P. 26): 194n.68
48.3–5 (G.-P. 26): 293
53 (G.-P. 23): 120n.2
55 (G.-P. 16): 286n.24
fr. 397: 247n.74
fr. 398: 67cn.60

Fragmenta Grammatica
fr. 449 Pf.: 93n.57
fr. 460 Pf.: 86 n.36

Fragmenta Incertae Sedis
fr. 473 Pf.: 107cn.11
fr. 475 Pf. (*SH* 253.11): 129
fr. 533 Pf.: 187
fr. 556 Pf.: 249n.81
fr. 571.2 Pf.: 195n.69
fr. 589 Pf.: 86n.36

Fragmenta Lyrica
fr. 226: 4, 9–11, 13, 15, 221n.6, 235
fr. 227 (*Pannychis*): 4, 9–11, 13, 15
fr. 228 (*Deification of Arsinoe*): 4, 9–11, 13, 15, 123, 298n.51
fr. 229 (*Branchus*): 4, 9–11, 13, 15, 160cn.30, 192, 200

Hecale
fr. 260.25–26 Pf. (Hollis fr. 70.10–11): 202n.80
fr. 260.56–57 Pf. (Hollis fr. 74.15–16): 181n.33

Callimachus *(continued)*
Hecale
SH fr. 288.69 (fr. 74.28 Hollis): 238
fr. 321 Pf. (Hollis fr. 86): 241n.54
Hymns
1.1: 70n.1
1.1–3: 127n.18
1.8–9: 121–22
1.12–13: 179n.31
1.19: 62cn.10
1.57–67: 128n.20
1.60–67: 134n.31
1.91–93: 128n.19
2.3–5: 180
2.19: 142
2.32–41: 137–38n.37
2.33: 142
2.42: 291
2.42–46: 136n.34
2.55–64: 95, 136–37
2.65ff: 137n.36
2.75–76: 130n.23
2.80–83: 80n.25
2.105–13: 12
2.110–12: 49n.56
3.15–17: 121
3.124–28: 78
3.148: 67cn.60
3.162–65: 121
3.226: 11
4.1: 70n.1
4.2: 143
4.19: 102n.76
4.171–87: 101n.75
4.179: 67cn.60
4.249–54: 180
4.260–65: 138n.38
4.264–65: 135n.33
4.267: 67cn.60
4.284–85: 298n.54
4.316–26: 100–1
4.326: 192
5.14: 189
5.25–26: 192
5.26: 202
5.115: 209cn.39
5.131–33: 94n.60
6.8–17: 177n.23
6.10–23: 134n.31
6.63–64: 188n.54
6.65–67: 254n.101
6.70–71: 133
6.78: 107cn.21
6.88–93: 253n.96
6.316–24: 298n.53
Iambi
1.1: 7, 18, 47, 22cn.1, 61, 71n.3, 158cn.1
1.1–2: 59
1.1–4: 37, 183, 197
1.2: 22cn.2
1.2+1.4: 38n.22
1.3: 3n.5, 46, 146n.61, 190
1.3–4: 39, 40n.28, 74
1.5–39: 13
1.6: 22cn.6, 42n.33, 43, 48, 147
1.6–11: 41
1.7: 22cn.7, 42–43
1.8: 44
1.9–11: 44
1.10–11: 80, 150, 184
1.11: 12, 23cn.11 (*bis*), 43, 46, 51, 90, 148, 187
1.12–25: 23cn.12–25, 48–49
1.16: 48
1.17: 44
1.18–24: 48
1.21: 23cn.21, 48–49
1.22: 24cn.22
1.23: 24cn.23, 48–49
1.26: 22cn.6, 48n.53
1.26–28: 42n.31, 44, 150
1.26–35: 49–53
1.28: 23cn.12–25, 50
1.28–29: 51
1.29–30: 80n.25, 150
1.31: 12, 64cn.24, 64cn.25, 51, 90, 146
1.31–33: 51
1.32: 147
1.32–35: 52
1.33: 12, 81, 90, 144
1.33–34: 194
1.34: 24–25cn.34
1.34–35: 52–53, 59, 76n.15, 96
1.35: 59, 147
1.37: 114cn.37
1.38–39: 96
1.39: 53n.66
1.40: 148
1.41: 25cn.41, 115cn.41
1.42: 115cn.42
1.45: 293
1.47: 148
1.49: 148
1.52: 57n.78, 149
1.52–53: 149

1.53–55: 150
1.57: 146
1.57–58: 150
1.58: 146
1.59–66: 146
1.60: 116cn.60, 146
1.62: 26cn.62
1.65: 138n.40
1.69–71: 150
1.73: 149
1.76–77: 148, 150
1.77: 105
1.78–79: 53–54, 80
1.78–98: 53–59
1.79: 56n.74
1.82: 56n.74
1.82–83: 53, 55–56, 188n.53
1.86: 56, 56n.74
1.86–98: 53
1.88: 51, 57, 178, 259, 261
1.89: 12, 56–58, 64cn.27, 90
1.91–92: 12, 64cn.25, 90
1.92: 44, 56
1.92–93: 58, 232n.28
1.93: 59
1.95: 30cn.21, 59
1.97: 59, 64cn.25, 77n.16, 149
1.98: 28cn.98, 53, 115cn.42, 178, 301
2.1: 71n.4, 176
2.1–2: 187
2.1–3: 53, 135n.32
2.2: 176, 179
2.2–3: 187
2.3: 74, 177
2.4: 53, 154cn.4, 178, 182–83
2.4–5: 182–83
2.4–17: 182
2.5: 154cn.5
2.6: 182–83
2.7: 179–80, 183
2.7–10: 183
2.8: 154cn.8, 183
2.8–10: 183
2.9: 184
2.10: 154cn.10, 184
2.10–11: 184, 186
2.10–13: 184
2.10–15: 48
2.11: 185–86
2.12: 185–87
2.13: 186, 187
2.14: 80, 187
2.15: 91, 156cn.31–32, 183–84, 186
2.15–16: 184, 190
2.15–17: 39n.25, 156cn.31–32, 183
2.16: 186, 195
2.17: 190
3.1: 44n.40, 71n.4, 126n.14, 222–23, 226
3.2: 206–7cn.2
3.2–23: 221, 223
3.5: 207cn.5
3.8: 207cn.8
3.9: 223–24, 226
3.10: 207cn.2, 223–24, 233n.32
3.11: 206cn.2, 224, 231–32n.28, 239
3.12: 207cn.14, 224
3.13: 207cn.13, 207cn.14, 223
3.14: 207cn.14
3.15: 207cn.13, 207cn.15, 223–24
3.17: 223, 226, 232, 233n.32
3.18: 223
3.19–23: 237
3.24: 76n.13, 223, 237–38
3.24–25: 242
3.24–30: 233
3.24–39: 221, 225, 233–51, 236–37
3.25: 208cn.25, 238
3.26: 234, 238
3.26–29: 241
3.27: 208cn.27, 237
3.27–29: 207cn.15
3.28: 234, 237
3.29: 208cn.29, 239–41
3.30: 178, 224, 238–39, 241
3.30–39: 241
3.31: 208cn.31, 238–39
3.31–39: 233
3.32: 242–44
3.33: 208cn.33 (*bis*), 239, 241–42, 244–45
3.34: 212cn.4, 245
3.34–39: 245
3.35: 221, 246
3.35–39: 247
3.36: 66cn.47, 209cn.36, 246–47
3.37–38: 246–47
3.38–39: 44n.40, 81, 226, 238, 242, 301
3.39: 209cn.39, 212cn.7, 225n.16, 248
4.1: 71n.3, 158cn.1 (*bis*), 193n.65, 196
4.2–10: 194

Callimachus *(continued)*
Iambi
4.6: 37n.16, 193
4.6–7: 201
4.6–8: 197, 199, 292
4.7: 193n.64, 200
4.7–8: 199
4.10: 199
4.13: 159cn.13, 159cn.17, 199
4.17: 159cn.17
4.18–21: 199
4.18–43: 199–202
4.20: 199
4.22: 199
4.22–23: 200
4.24: 203
4.26–27: 200
4.27: 202
4.28: 199
4.28–29: 200
4.30: 160cn.30
4.31: 201–2
4.33: 202
4.34–36: 192
4.37: 160–61cn.37, 200
4.37–40: 199
4.37–43: 200
4.39: 200–1
4.40: 160cn.37
4.43: 161cn.43, 202
4.44–45: 202
4.46: 64cn.24, 203
4.46–48: 181, 203
4.46–92: 202–3
4.48: 161cn.48
4.57–59: 203
4.63: 200, 203
4.64: 162cn.64
4.66–68: 202
4.67: 202
4.70–72: 203
4.74: 162cn.74, 203
4.75: 163cn.75
4.76: 202
4.77: 203
4.79–80: 203
4.81–82: 203
4.84: 99–102, 192
4.91: 203
4.92: 203
4.96: 164cn.96, 198
4.98: 196
4.98–103: 195
4.100: 164cn.100
4.101: 204
4.102: 204
4.105–6: 204
4.106: 193
4.107–12: 193, 204
4.108: 258
4.110: 204
4.112: 204
4.117: 166: cn.117, 193
5.1: 71n.3, 256, 260–61
5.1–2: 209cn.39
5.2: 37n.16, 261n.128
5.3: 178, 256, 261
5.4: 212cn.4, 245
5.4–5: 262
5.7: 209cn.39, 212cn.7, 248n.80
5.9: 212cn.9
5.10–13: 262
5.11: 212cn.11
5.12: 212–13cn.12, 261
5.13: 213cn.13
5.14: 213cn.14
5.16: 213cn.16
5.17: 262
5.19: 213cn.19
5.20: 262
5.22: 254n.101, 258, 260, 262
5.23–29: 257, 263, 264
5.25: 214cn.25 (*bis*)
5.30: 214cn.30, 260, 264
5.31–33: 260, 264
5.31–34: 263
5.34: 214cn.34
5.35–53: 254, 264
5.40 (fr. 195a, 3): 214cn. fr. 195a, 3
5.41: 256
5.67: 301
6.1: 290, 296
6.11: 268cn.11, 289n.31
6.12: 269cn.12, 289n.31
6.22: 269cn.22, 290–91
6.22–49: 291
6.29: 291
6.37: 292
6.39: 292
6.42–44: 292
6.43: 270cn.43, 292
6.43–44: 290
6.44: 292
6.45–46: 293
6.58–62: 290, 293
7.1: 290, 296
7.2: 295, 298

7.3: 295, 298
7.4: 299
7.5: 298n.55, 299
7.13: 299
7.14: 272cn.14
7.17: 299
7.19: 299
7.21: 299
7.25: 272cn.25, 298–99
7.39–40: 274cn.39–40
7.41: 274cn.41, 299
7.44–45: 299
7.50: 274cn.50
9.2: 278cn.2
12.1: 71, 106, 121, 126, 133–34, 290
12.1–6: 106
12.2: 106cn.2, 121
12.5: 106cn.5
12.7–86: 106
12.9: 106cn.9, 107cn.18
12.11: 107cn.11
12.12: 111cn.62
12.14: 109cn.26
12.15–17: 121–22
12.17: 107cn.17
12.18: 107cn.18, 107cn.20
12.18–19: 125
12.19: 107cn.19
12.20: 107cn.20, 128–29
12.20–26: 127
12.20–46: 126
12.21: 107cn.21
12.22: 107cn.20
12.23–24: 134
12.23–25: 108cn.23–35, 134
12.24: 135–36
12.26: 108cn.26, 127
12.27: 130, 299
12.27–28: 95n.62, 131n.25
12.27–30: 129
12.29: 109cn.29
12.31: 131–32, 302n.66
12.31–35: 131
12.33: 132
12.36–39: 132
12.36–40: 131, 133
12.37: 109cn.37
12.38: 109cn.38
12.38–39: 131
12.40: 132
12.41: 133
12.41–44: 133
12.42: 133
12.43: 133
12.44: 133
12.45: 109cn.45
12.45–46: 133–34
12.47: 126, 133–36, 138, 142
12.47–73: 126
12.48: 135
12.48–53: 138
12.49: 134
12.51: 109cn.51, 134–35
12.52: 110cn.52, 135
12.53: 110cn.53, 125, 135
12.54–55: 135
12.55: 110cn.55, 134
12.56: 134–36, 142, 291
12.56–57: 95n.62, 110cn.55
12.57: 128, 133, 135–36
12.57–70: 14, 106, 126
12.58: 110cn.58, 140
12.60: 108–9cn.26
12.61: 110cn.61
12.62: 109cn.26, 111cn.62
12.63: 111cn.63
12.64: 111cn.64
12.65: 128
12.65–70: 110cn.55
12.66: 130–31, 289n.33, 299
12.67: 141
12.68: 135, 232
12.69: 141
12.69–70: 137
12.70: 141
12.72: 135
12.73: 133, 142
12.74: 107cn.19, 111cn.74, 126
12.75: 126n.14, 129, 135, 142
12.76–78: 143
12.77: 112cn.77, 143
12.78: 126n.14, 143
12.79: 126
12.81: 126
12.81–82: 112cn.81–82
12.82: 126, 143
12.86: 126, 143
13.1: 44n.40, 62cn.1, 70–72, 206cn.2
13.1–9: 70–74
13.2–33: 62
13.5: 62cn.5, 64cn.25, 72, 74
13.7: 72–7413.10: 62cn.10, 70
13.11: 70
13.11–14: 42n.33, 76–77, 84
13.11–22: 74–81
13.12: 62cn.12

Callimachus *(continued)*
Iambi
13.14: 63cn.12, 77–78, 99n.70, 103, 238
13.15–18: 80
13.16: 9n.13
13.17: 12, 80n.27, 90, 187
13.17–18: 9, 12, 100, 295
13.18: 63cn.18
13.19–21: 54n.69, 55, 75
13.22: 70, 79, 81, 99, 214cn. fr. 195a.3
13.24: 12, 64cn.24 (*ter*), 70, 81, 84, 90
13.24–25: 12, 90
13.25: 64cn.25 (*bis*)
13.25–26: 12, 90
13.26: 81
13.27: 12, 64–65cn.27, 82, 84, 90
13.30–32: 48, 65cn.36
13.30–33: 82–83, 85, 88
13.31: 24cn.23, 65cn.31, 66cn.43, 73n.10
13.31–32: 9, 73n.10, 87
13.32: 185n.43
13.33: 65cn.33, 70, 81, 95
13.34–66: 62
13.36: 65cn.36
13.38: 65cn.33, 84
13.40: 65cn.33, 81, 84, 95
13.41: 65cn.36, 95
13.41–45: 83
13.41–49: 91
13.43: 24cn.23, 66cn.43
13.43–45: 66cn.43
13.43–49: 65cn.36
13.44–45: 87–88
13.45: 24cn.23, 73n.10, 95
13.47: 66cn.47, 95, 292
13.48–49: 66cn.48–49, 93–94
13.49–52: 62
13.50ff.: 79n.22, 81
13.50–51: 95–96
13.52: 66cn.52
13.52ff.: 84
13.52–53: 81, 95, 97
13.53: 97, 99
13.54–56: 67cn.54–56, 79n.23
13.55–56: 75, 84
13.57–59: 81
13.58–59: 99
13.59: 99n.70
13.60: 67cn.60, 97, 99
13.60–61: 46n.48
13.61: 99
13.62: 99–100, 192
13.63: 70, 95
13.64: 7, 61
13.64–66: 36, 42n.33, 60, 77, 81, 84
13.66: 99n.70, 238
fr. 204: 106
fr. 204a Pf.: 65cn.33
fr. 210 Pf.: 212
fr. 210.6 Pf: 261
fr. 213 Pf.: 212
fr. 221 Pf.: 255n.104, 278, 300, 302
fr. 222 Pf.: 231
Diegesis (*P. Mil.* I 18)
III 14: 302n.66
IV 1–4: 302n.66
VI inscription: 9n.14
VI 2: 30cn.2, 145
VI 2–3: 258
VI 3: 30cn.3, 45, 256
VI 3–4: 45
VI 4–6: 23cn.12–25, 257n.114
VI 8: 138n.40
VI 20: 204
VI 18–19: 150
VI 19–20: 53n.67, 93n.58
VI 19–21: 145
VI 20–21: 204
VI 21: 30cn.21, 53n.67, 93n.58, 156cn.31–32, 195
VI 23–25: 181
VI 24: 179
VI 25: 154cn.5
VI 25–27: 156
VI 30: 257
VI 31–32: 156cn.31–32
VI 34–40: 221
VI 37–38: 76n.13, 221, 252n.90, 257
VI 37–39: 248–49
VI 39–40: 237, 241
VII 2: 195
VII 2–3: 193, 196
VII 3: 193–94
VII 3–4: 195
VII 3–8: 195
VII 5: 195
VII 5–6: 168cn.5–6, 203, 255n.103
VII 6: 235
VII 6–7: 195

VII 8: 195
VII 11: 195
VII 12: 196
VII 12–17: 195
VII 13–14: 196
VII 14: 195
VII 17: 193n.65
VII 18: 193n.65
VII 20: 256
VII 20–21: 45n.43, 76n.13, 256
VII 20–23: 255
VII 21: 256–57
VII 21–24: 219n.4
VII 22: 256–57
VII 23: 251–52, 256–60
VII 23–24: 216cn.23–24, 258
VII 24: 258
VII 26: 288
VIII 7: 298
VIII 9: 276cn.9
VIII 9–10: 300
VIII 18: 276cn.18, 298
VIII 38: 301
VIII 39–40: 235, 255n.104, 302
IX 26–27: 120, 128
IX 29: 112cn.29
IX 30: 126n.14
IX 33–34: 75
IX 33–35: 12n.22
IX 33–36: 9
IX 34: 68cn.34
IX 35–38: 91
IX 37–38: 299
X 1–2: 221n.6, 235
X 4–5: 235
X 18 inscription: 9n.14
Suda Vita: 9
s.v. Καλλίμαχος 8–9: 259

Catullus
Carmina
31: 72n.7
36.5: 11n.18
63: 243
63.64: 301n.65
64: 125
66.25–28: 123n.10

Cercidas (Powell)
fr. 7.14: 239
fr. 17 (?): 223n.11

Chariton
Chaereas and Callirhoe
1.1.10: 301n.65

Cleon of Curion
339a *SH*: 256n.108

George Choeroboscus
Περὶ τρόπων ποιητικῶν
Spengel, *Rhetores Graeci* III 245.6: 263n.136

Clement of Alexandria
Stromateis
5 14, 100 II p. 382 Stählin: 154
5 8, 48 II p. 359 Stählin: 200n.76

Cratinus
PCG 246–68: 145n.58
PCG 450: 78n.21
PCG 952 (*adespota*): 298n.55

ps.-Demetrius
On Style
5: 88n.43

Demosthenes
45.79: 257n.113

Diodorus of Sicily
10.6.4: 26cn.62

Diogenes Laertius
1.21: 144

ps.-Dionysus
iii: 121

Dioscorides
A.P. 7.410 (G.-P. 20): 94n.61

Empedocles
fr. 74 DK: 187

Ephorus
FGrH 70, fr. 149.21: 235, 255n.103

Epicharmus
PCG 238: 260n.125

Epigrammata Anonyma
14 G.-P. (*A.P.* 12.143): 302–3

Euripides
Alcmeon: 54n.68
Bacchae
150: 246n.69
274–80: 133n.29
743: 66cn.52
864–65: 246n.69
Cyclops
583–84: 247n.75
Electra
1027–28: 247n.73
Hecuba
26 *schol.*: 258n.115
Heracles
871: 42n.32
Hippolytus
hypothesis 27: 91n.51
76–78: 49n.55
515: 162cn.74
Iphigenaia at Aulis
475–76: 261n.128
Medea
21–22: 207cn.15
92: 204n.83
187–88: 204n.83
Orestes
750 *schol.*: 258n.115

Gregory of Corinth
Περὶ τρόπων ποιητικῶν
Rhetores Graeci III 216, 3 (Spengel): 263n.137

Harpocration
Ἴων (fr. 449 Pf.): 93n.57

Hermeias
fr. 1.1 (Powell): 37n.16

Hermesianax
fr. 7.35–36 (Powell): 65cn.31

Herodas
Mimiambi
1: 237
1.29: 45
1.89: 51n.62
3: 262
3.2: 213cn.14
4: 35
4.46: 239
4.57–59: 130
5.30: 115cn.42
6.39: 239
6.98: 59n.88
7.65: 65cn.27
8.79: 77n.19

Herodotus
Histories
2.48.2: 247n.75
2.51: 302n.66
3.40–43: 297n.50
3.89.3: 58n.83
3.102.2: 140

Hesiod
Theogony
26: 80n.26
50–51: 98
81–84: 96n.65
96–97: 96n.66
Works and Days
20–26: 98
25–26: 97
52–53: 98
202–12: 170
213: 170
221: 207cn.13, 223

Hesychius
κυσός: 28n.98

Hipponax
fr. *1 W. (187 dub. Deg.): 37n.15, 38n.19, 39n.23
fr. 3 W. (1 Deg.): 300n.61
fr. 3a.1 W. (2 Deg.): 300n.61
fr. 5–10 W. (26, 6, 27–30 Deg.): 55
fr. 8 W. (28 Deg.): 209cn.39
fr. 9 W. (29 Deg.): 55
fr. 12 W. (20 Deg.): 42n.34, 209cn.33
fr. 12.2 W. (20.2 Deg.): 34n.7, 39n.23
fr. 13 W. (21 Deg.): 38n.19
fr. 13.1 W. (21 Deg.): 150
fr. 14.1 W. (22 Deg.): 150
fr. 15 W. (18 Deg.): 34n.7, 39n.23, 209cn.33
fr. 20 W. (8 Deg.): 64cn.27
fr. 26.3–6 W. (36 Deg.): 59
fr. 27 W. (38 Deg.): 11
fr. 28 W. (39 Deg.): 34, 74, 79, 281n.8
fr. 28.5 W. (39 Deg.): 67cn.54–56, 79
fr. 32 W. (42 Deg.): 38n.19, 227

fr. 32.1 W. (42 Deg.): 300n.61
fr. 32.1–2 W. (42 Deg.): 71, 82n.32
fr. 32.4 W. (42 Deg.): 38n.17
fr. 34 W. (43 Deg.): 38n.19, 227, 243
fr. 35 W. (10 Deg.): 300n.61
fr. 36 W. (44 Deg.): 38n.19, 227–28, 243
fr. 37 W. (46 Deg.): 38n.17, 55
fr. 38 W. (47 Deg.): 82n.32, 243
fr. 39 W. (48 Deg.): 38n.19
fr. 42 W. (7 Deg.): 282
fr. 47.1 W. (51 Deg.): 114cn.37
fr. 47.2 W. (51 Deg.): 300n.61
fr. 48 W. (52 Deg.): 58n.85
fr. 63 W. (65 Deg.): 143–44
fr. 70.11 W. (70.1 Deg.): 34n.6
fr. 79 W. (79 Deg.): 256
fr. 79.9 W. (79 Deg.): 300n.61
fr. 79.11 W. (79 Deg.): 42n.37
fr. 79.17–20 W. (79 Deg.): 58n.82
fr. 84 W. (86 Deg.): 251n.89
fr. 84.17 W. (86 Deg.): 23cn.11
fr. 84.18 W. (86 Deg.): 39n.23
fr. 92.10–11 W. (95 Deg.): 50
fr. 95.3–4 (98 Deg.): 39n.23
fr. 95.9 W. (98 Deg.): 208cn.33, 239
fr. 95.12 W. (98 Deg.): 208cn.33
fr. 95a W. (98 Deg.): 39n.23
fr. 103 W. (106 Deg.): 11
fr. 103.1–2 W. (106 Deg.): 56
fr. 105.6 W. (108 Deg.): 201
fr. *115 W. (194 dub. Deg.): 34n.10, 219–20
frr. 115–18 W. (129–31 Deg.): 266n.2
fr. *117 W. (196 dub. Deg.): 34n.9
fr. *117.4 (196.4 dub. Deg.): 38n.17
fr. 118 W. (129 Deg.): 34n.8, 56n.77, 253–54, 256, 260
fr. 118.7–9 W. (129 Deg.): 56
fr. 118.9 W. (129 Deg): 254n.101
fr. 118.11 W. (129 Deg.): 42n.3
fr. 120 W. (121 Deg.): 39n.23, 55n.72, 65cn.27
fr. 121 W. (122 Deg.): 55n.72, 65cn.27
fr. 123 W. (12 Deg.): 144
fr. 127 W. (125 Deg.): 245n.68
fr. 128 W. (126 Deg.): 34n.8
fr. 136 W. (144Deg.): 39n.23
fr. 156 W. (167 Deg.): 245n.68
fr. 167 W. (177 Deg.): 58n.85
fr. 177 W. (208 Deg.): 300n.61

Homer
Iliad
1.10: 160cn.30
2.211–77: 218
5.586: 263
16.259–65: 50n.58
16.351–56: 141n.48
16.749: 263
21. 273–83: 299
23.327ff: 263
24.55–63: 124n.13
24.258–62: 141n.48

Homeric Hymns
Hymn to Demeter
6: 132
16–18: 132
Hymn to Dionysus
6–8: 131
Hymn to Hermes
1–2: 71n.6

Horace
Epistles
1.6.65–66: 73n.10
2.1.250–51: 77n.19
2.2.90–101: 73n.10
Epodes
6.11–14: 10
6.13–14: 39n.23
15.7: 141n.49
Satires
1.4: 82n.31
1.4.33–38: 54n.70
1.4.34: 67cn.52
1.8: 296
1.10: 82n.31

Inscriptiones Graecae
XII 2.503.10: 276cn.18

Inscriptions de Délos
9: 33n.4

Ion of Chios
fr. 26a–b L.: 66cn.47
fr. 42 L.: 66cn.47
fr. 87 L.: 88
fr. 88 L.: 88
Κοσμολογικός: 88

Justin
Epitome
20.2.1: 299n.56

Juvenal
Satires
14.208–9: 262

Leonidas of Tarentum
Ep. 58 G.-P.: 36, 284

Lucian
Amores 54: 213cn.12
Dialogi Deorum 25 (26): 301n.64
Gallus 23: 261–62
Lis Consonantium (*Iudicium Vocalium*) 9: 292n.38
Philopseudeis 34.6.4–7: 86n.37
Rhetorum Praeceptor 1: 261
Somnium 22: 194n.68
Toxaris 20: 299

Lysias
1.49: 257n.112

Lycophron
Alexandra 930–31: 298n.55
schol. to 425: 74
schol. to 1170: 245–46n.68

Menander Rhetor
2 [6]: 124n.13
2 [8]: 121

Nonnus
Dionysiaca
5.125–39: 132n.28
5.127: 108cn.26, 127
5.571: 124

Nossis
Ep. 11.1–2 G.-P.: 78n.21

Oenomaus
fr. 13. Hammerstaedt: 297n.50

Ovid
Amores
2.6: 189n.56
3.1: 192n.64
Ibis
475–6 *schol.* fr. 664 Pf.: 188n.55
Metamorphoses
3.577–691: 132
8.882: 66–67cn.52
Remedia Amoris
377–82: 73n.10

Papyri
P. Hal. 1.260–65: 261
P. Mich. Inv. 4967: 14, 106, 110cn.61, 111cn.62, 111cn.64, 126, 135
P. Mil. I 18: 3–4, 9, 13, 30cn.3
P. Oxy. 661: 272, 296
P. Oxy. 1011: 3, 13–14, 22, 53, 62, 65cn.33, 72cn.8, 106, 111cn.62, 111cn.64, 154, 158, 193, 206
P. Oxy. 1011, fol. 2v: 22
P. Oxy. 1011, fol. 2r: 22
P. Oxy. 1011, fol. 3v: 22, 53
P. Oxy. 1011, fol. 3r: 22, 53
P. Oxy. 1011, fol. 5r: 204
P. Oxy. 1011, fol. 6r: 62
P. Oxy. 1011, fol. 6r *schol.* 24: 242n.59
P. Oxy. 1011, fol. 6r, fr. 9v Hu.: 66cn.48–49
P. Oxy. 1011, fol. 6v: 62
P. Oxy. 1363: 22, 23cn.12–25
P. Oxy. 2171: 212, 296
P. Oxy. 2171, fr. 1, 1–9: 212, 254
P. Oxy. 2171, fr. 2, col. II: 291
P. Oxy. 2171, frr. 2–3: 268
P. Oxy. 2171, fr. 3: 272
P. Oxy. 2171+2172: 4n.8, 9
P. Oxy. 2172: 8
P. Oxy. 2176: 253
P. Oxy. 2215: 158
P. Oxy. 2215, fr. 1: 206
P. Oxy. 2218: 106
P. Oxy. 2221, col. II, lines 5–6: 278
P. Ryl. 485: 158, 212
P. Ryl. 572: 256n.105
PSI 1094 (*Scholia Florentina*): 13
PSI 1094 9 [fr. a] 1–9: 23cn.12–25
PSI 1094 [fr. b]:
to 1.26ff: 22n.6
to 1.26–27: 50n.57
to 1.28: 50–51
to 1.37: 114cn.37
PSI 1216: 4n.8, 9, 158, 166cn.117, 212, 268, 290
PSI 1216 col. 1 line 18: 213cn.13

Paroemiographi Graeci
II p. 171: 209cn.39, 248n.78

Pausanias
Description of Greece
5.10.2: 293n.42
5.11.1: 292

5.11.7: 292n.37
5.11.9: 289n.27
10.19.3: 297n.50

Persius
1.1: 301

Petronius
Satyricon
81.5: 238n.41

Philo of Alexandria
De confusione linguae
6–8: 178–79, 187

Phoenix (Powell)
fr. 1.1–2: 37–38n.16, 147
fr. 1.13–17: 37–38n.16
fr. 1.15: 22cn.1
fr. 1.17: 22cn.1
fr. 4: 149–50
fr. 6.4: 239

Pindar
Isthmian Odes
2.9b *schol.*: 229n.22
2.6–8: 231
2.6–11: 229n.20
2.9 *schol.* (fr. 222 Pf.): 231
7.3–5: 133n.29
Olympian Odes
2.87–88: 174
6.1–4: 93n.59
10.55 *schol.*: 269cn.12
Pythian Odes
1.97–98: 110cn.52
2.3–4: 39n.24
Fr. 32 S.-M.: 124n.13

Plato
Alcibiades I
111e: 239
121d5–7: 94n.61
Charmides
301n.65
Epistles
5.321c: 260
Ion
533b5–c2: 85n.35
534a7–b6: 89n.45
534b: 174
534b7–c7: 85, 87n.39
534c: 83
535a6–10: 87n.40
Laws
669d2–5: 80n.27
700a–b: 68cn.34
Phaedo
85b: 180
Phaedrus
241c6–d1: 141–42
268e: 242n.57
Republic
400b4–c1: 88n.43
Statesman
272b8–d2: 182n.34
Symposium
223c6–d6: 86n.39
Theages
122b: 260

Pliny
Natural History
36.11: 32–33n.3

Plutarch
Amatorius
21 p. 766f: 247n.75
De audiendis poetis
12 p. 34a: 247n.75
Fortune of the Romans
1.316d: 88n.42

Pollux
Onomasticon
5.162: 272cn.25

Posidippus
Epigrams
19 G.-P.: 286

Propertius
1.9.11–12: 73n.10
4.2: 296
4.2.59–60: 272cn.25

Quintus of Smyrna
4.323: 298n.55
12.28: 298n.55

Sappho (L.-P.)
fr. 31: 234n.35
fr. 111.5: 240n.49
fr. 112.1: 240n.49
fr. 115: 240n.49
fr. 116: 240n.49
fr. 117: 240n.49
fr. 156: 132n.27
fr. 168: 246n.71

Scriptores Physiognomici Graeci
I 429, 6: 194

Semonides
fr. 7 W.: 177n.24

Simias of Rhodes
Πέλεκυς
general: 299n.56
line 5: 298n.55

Simonides
fr. 16 W.: 138–39n.40

Solon
fr. 33 W.: 75n.12
fr. 34 W.: 75n.12
fr. 37 W.: 99n.71

Sophocles
Oedipus Rex
93 *schol.*: 258
fr. 501.2: 111cn.63

Sophron
PCG 4: 163cn.74

Stesichorus
fr. 210 Davies (*Oresteia*): 39n.26

Strabo
Geography
8.353–54: 289n.27
14.644: 56n.75

Suda
s.v. Ἱππῶναξ: 32n.3
s.v. Χλαζόμενοι: 42n.33

Suetonius
On the Grammarians
10.4: 46n.46

Susarion
fr. 1 W.: 37n.16

Theocritus
Epigrams (Gow)
19 (G.-P. 13): 36, 283
19.3 (G.-P. 13): 239
21 (G.-P. 14): 283
Idylls
1: 131n.26, 294
1.26: 150n.70
1.52–54: 137n.35
2: 237
2.1: 162cn.74
2.143: 258n.116
2.101: 51n.62
3.8: 51n.62
3.8–9: 194
7: 191n.62
[8]: 13
11: 237
11.80–81: 213cn.12
12.13: 235
12.30–33: 237n.40
15: 240
15.70–73: 51n.63
15.72–144: 246n.72
15.98: 246n.70
15.129: 240n.50
15.134: 247
16: 249n.84
16.5–15: 230
16.104–9: 231n.26
17: 123
17.1–2: 127n.18
17.106–7 *scholion*: 140n.43
17.112–14: 134n.30
18: 240
18.9: 240n.51
[20.19]: 239
[23]: 303n.70
[25]: 124n.12

Theognidea
15–16: 124n.13, 143n.51
581–82: 247n.73

Tibullus
1.4: 241n.56, 296
1.4.21–24: 237n.39
1.4.70: 209cn.36, 243
1.9: 241n.56
1.9.1–2: 237n.39
1.9.17: 221n.6
1.9.37: 239n.44

Trypho
Περὶ τρόπων ποιητικῶν
Rhetores Graeci III 206, 15 (Spengel): 159cn.13

Varro
On the Latin Language
7.34: 302n.66

Vergil
Aeneid
2.264: 298n.55
12.104: 66cn.52
Georgics
3.232: 66cn.52

Xenophanes
fr. 21 Gent.-Pr.: 229n.23

Xenophon
Memorabilia
2.7.13: 182n.34

This page intentionally left blank

Greek Index

This index includes entries for all complete words that appear in the ten *Iambi* that are the subject of this study. Some incomplete words, particularly those that are treated in the commentary notes or in the interpretation(s), are also included, as are several alternate conjectured readings. For further reference the reader is directed to Pfeiffer's *Index Vocabulorum* (II 141–208).

* refers to a conjecture accepted into the text. ‡ refers to a conjecture not accepted into the text, although it may nonetheless be taken into account in the *en face* translation. † refers to a dubious papyrus reading. In this index I adopt Pfeiffer's practice of only printing papyrological sigla if their omission would result in ambiguity. References are to *Iambus* and line.

ἃ 5.30
(ἀγαθός) ὠγαθή 12.86, τὠγαθόν 3.31
(ἀγαπάω) ἠγάπηcαν 13.51
ἀγινεῦcιν 4.55
(ἅγιος) θῴγιον 6.29
ἄγκυραι 1.47
(ἀγκῶν) ἀγκῶνα 1.43
ἀγνεύῃ 12.69
(ἀγνός) ἁγνή 4.39
(ἄγνυμι) ἄξωcιν 5.29
(ἀγριόω) ἀγριωμένοc 7.13
(ἄγω) ἄγειν 5.11, ἄγων 12.42, ἄξω 1.32, ‡ἦ[γε]ν 12.23, ἤγαγον 12.37
(ἀγών) ὠγών 4.58
(ἄδικος) ἄδικα 1.11
Ἄδωνιν 3.37
ἄεθλον 4.57, κἄεθλον 4.33
ἀείδω 13.63, -ει 4.27, -οντα 1.3, ᾄδοντα 2.17, *ἀείcομαι 12.19, ἤειcα 12.74, ἤειcαc 4.48
(ἀείζωος) ἀειζώων 4.69
Ἀθανᾳ[(prob. nomen urbis) 6.60
Ἀθηναίηc 12.65
ἄθυμος 5.45
αἰαῖ 3.37
(Ἀΐδης) Ἄιδην 1.15
(αἰνέω) αἰνεῖται 4.89, αἰνήcουcι 12.64
(αἴνιγμα) τᾴνιγμα 5.33
Αἰνίων 7.1
(αἶνος) αἶνον 4.6
αἰπόλῳ 1.26
(αἱρέω) εἷλε 1.92
(αἴcιος) αἰcίῳ 1.56
αἰcυμνέ̣ω̣ν 2.6
Αἴcωποc 2.15
ἄκληρον 3.17
(ἀκούω) -ε 4.6, 5.2, ἀκούcωcι 13.59, ἀκούcαθ' 1.1, ‡ἀκουcτέα 13.25
(ἀκριβόω) ἠκριβωμένην 12.66
(ἄκρος) ἄκρων 4.35, -οιc 13.61
Ἀκτῆc 4.68
‡ἀλάζων 1.11
(ἀλγέω) ἀλγεῖc 4.82, -έων 5.17, ἤλγηcε 4.94
Ἀλεῖος 6.1
(ἀλής) ἀλέεc 1.9
ἀλινδεῖcθαι 1.42
†αλιτιτω 4.75
Ἀλκμέων 1.78
ἀλλ(ά) passim, οὐ γὰρ ἀλλ' 1.1
ἀλλήλοιc 12.45, -αc 4.99, -ουc 4.107
(ἄλλος) ἄλλην 12.55, -α 1.53, 4.44

ἀλλοτρίη 12.79
(ἅλc) ἁλόc 7.49, 12.30
ἅλφα 1.88, 5.3
(ἀμαθήc) ἀμαθῶc 13.14, 13.66
’Αμάξηc (sideris) 1.54
(ἁμαρτάνω) ἥμαρτεc 3.18
ἀμαυρώcει 12.67
(ἀμιλλάομαι) ἠμιλλῶντο 12.46
’Αμνιcοῦ 12.1
ἀμφί 4.68, 4.93
ἄν 3.34, 4.40, 5.22
ἀνά 1.44
(ἀναιδέοc) ἀναιδέωc 4.100
ἀναιcίμωμα 6.45
(ἀνακαίω) τὠνέκαυcαc 5.23
ἀνακρίνει 13.54
(ἀναλίcκω) ἀναλώcει 1.29
ἄναξ 3.1, 12.13, 12.79
(ἀναπαύω) ἀνέπαυcε *4.84, 13.62
(ἀναπλάττω) ἀνεπλάcθη 13.49
ἀναρρίπτειν 3.35
(ἀνάccω) ἀνάccοντεc 3.14
(ἀναcτέφω) ἀνεcτέψαντο 4.42
(’Ανδρόνικοc) ὠνδρόνικε 2.15
ἀνήρ 1.32, 4.68, ὠνήρ 7.4, ἄνδρα 5.5, ἄνδρεc 1.16, ἀνδρῶν 2.10, ἄνδραc 4.49, ὦνδρεc 1.6, ὦνδρεc 1.26
ἄνθρωποc 1.4 ὤν- 3.12, -ον 1.79, 3.37, -οι 1.36, *2.13, 4.39, 12.63, -πων 1.59
ἄνολβ’ 4.100
(ἀνολιcθάνω) ἀνώλιcθεν 1.75
(ἀντάω) *ἀντήc[αιτε 12.18
(ἀοιδή) ἀοιδ[άc 13.29
(ἀοιδόc) ἀοιδῷ 13.53
*ἀπαι.[13.16
(ἀπαλλάccω) *ἀπήλ[λαξε 4.44
ἅπαξ 13.45
ἀπάρξαcθαι 2.9
(ἀπειθέω) *ἀπειθήcειc 1.72
(ἄπειμι) τὠπιόντοc 1.47
ἀπεμπολῇ 13.27
(ἀπέρχομαι) ἀπέρχευ 6.62
ἀπηνέc 4.61
‡’Απ]ίου 12.29
ἀπ(ό) 1.27, ἀπ’ 4.35, τἀπό 5.2, ’πύ 7.42
*ἀποκνίζει 13.61
(ἀπόλλυμι) *ἀπόλλυcι 4.49
’Απόλλων 4.71, -νοc 1.8, *4.47, τὠπόλλωνοc 4.36, κἄπολλον 13.1, ὤπολλον 1.26, 3.1, 12.47
(ἀποπλέω) κἀποπλεῖν 1.97
ἀποπνίγειc 4.104
(ἀποcτέλλω) ἀπέcτειλεν 1.74
(ἀποτη . []) κἀποτη . [7.11
*ἀπρηγεῦνταc 3.32
ἄπωθε 4.97, 7.25
ἆρ’ 4.101
Ἄρηc 4.49
(ἀριcτεῖον) ἀριcτῆον 1.77
(ἀριcτερόc) ὠριcτερόc 4.22
(ἀριcτεύc) ἀριcτέων 4.51
(ἄριcτοc) ἄριcτον 4.59
’Αρκάc 1.32, *’Ἀρκ[άc 1.44
ἅρπαγεc 12.70
ἀρτεμέαc 4.31
Ἄρτεμι 12.1
‡ἀρ[τύο]υ[c]α 12.23
(ἀρχαῖοc) ἀρχαίοιc 4.67, -ουc 12.61, -ηc 12.48, ἀρχαῖον (neutr.) 13.16
ἀcτερίcκουc 1.55
(ἀcτήρ) ἀcτέραc 7.39
(ἀτιμάω) ἀτιμήcει 12.61
ἀτρεμαίωc 4.45
ἀτρεμίζει 5.25
ἀτρύτων 4.81
αὖθι 7.49
αὐλόν 3.36, 13.47
αυτ[13.30
(αὖτε) *αὐτ’ 3.6
(ἀϋτέω) ἠΰτει 12.51
αὐτίκα 12.58
αὖτιc 4.17, 7.46
αὐτόc 1.33, 6.37, -όν 1.80, -οί 4.42, -ή 4.54, καὐταί 13.59, -αῖc 4.72
*αὔτωc 2.2
αὐχένοc 12.29
(ἄφρων) ὤφρων 4.18, 4.28, 4.40
’Αχερο[ντ]οc 1.35
ἄχριc 5.23
ἀψευδέα 12.15

Βαθυκλῆc 1.32
Βάκιc 5.31
βάλλει 1.79
βάτοc 4.96
βῆτ[α 5.3
βιβλία 1.11
Βίηc 1.73
βλέπει 12.8, ἔβλεψε 4.102, βλέψαι 3.31, -αc 1.44, *βλ[έπ 7.39
(βούλομαι) β]ούλεcθε 1.49
Βουπάλειον 1.4
(βοῦc) βοῦν 1.2
Βράγχοc 4.28
βραχίονα 13.56
*βρέταc 6.29
βυccόθεν 12.59
βωμοί 1.14

γαμβρόν 3.29
γάρ passim ἀλλ᾽ . . . γάρ 4.56, καὶ γάρ 1.33, 1.39, 1.95, 4.58, 4.104, καὶ . . . γάρ 4.26, οὐ γάρ; (quaestio elliptica) 4.1, οὐ γὰρ ἀλλ᾽ 1.1
γαcτήρ 4.22, γαcτέρα 13.15
γ(ε) passim (post pronomen personale) μὴ τύ γ᾽ 7.46, (post pronomen demonstr.) *ταῦτά γ᾽ 4.100
γειτονεῦc᾽ 4.104
(γέλωc) γέλωτοc 1.94, *γέλω 5.30
γενεθλίην 12.21
Γενειόλα 9.1
γένειον 12.69
γενήν 13.54
γένοc 2.8
γέρων 1.11, -οντα 1.57, 4.53
γῆ 4.64, γῆc 1.27, γῆν 1.58
γηθέω 4.55
(γίγνομαι) γίνομαι 4.33, γίνηται 4.36, ἐγένετο 1.36, γενώμεθ᾽ 4.99, γενέcθω 1.31
(γιγνώcκω) γινώcκω 4.37, -ειν 12.16
(γλυκύc) γλυκεῖαν 12.45
γλ[υφῇ 12.27
γλῶccαν 1.83
γνώμην 1.53
(γόνυ) γούνατα 5.17
(γράφω) γράφοντα 1.58, ἔγραψε 1.60, γράφecθε 1.31
γρύζω 4.60
γυμνάζει 1.86
(γυμνόω) γυμνώcῃ 1.30, γυμνοῦται 4.23

δαίμων 1.63, 5.3, 6.37
(δαίc) δαῖταc 4.32
δάκρυ 12.38
δακτύλοιc 13.61
δάφνη 4.69, 4.80, 4.86, 4.101, 5.31, -ηc 4.73, -ῃ 4.26, 4.30, 4.78, -ην 4.7, 4.27 (bis), 4.64, 4.70, 4.71, 4.92
δ(έ) passim, τίc δ᾽ initio orationis 4.64, δέ tertio loco 12.65
δεῖ *1.34, 3.7
(δειπνέω) δειπνήcω 3.39
δέκα 6.31
*δέλτοι 5.41
(Δελφοί nomen loci) Δελφοῖc 4.59, -οὺc 4.35
(Δελφόc incola) Δελφοί 1.27, 2.16
δένδρεον 4.9, δένδρων 4.13, δενδρέων 4.97
δεξιόc 1.53, -ῇ 3.15, -ήν 3.27
δεcμόc 1.41
δέcποιναν 4.105
δεῦτε 1.9
δευτέρην 5.27, *δεύτερον (adv.) 4.78, δεύτερ᾽ 4.95
(δέχομαι) ἐδέξαντο 2.17
(δέω=ligo) δήcουc[ι 13.19
δή (inter praepositionem et (pro-) nomen) 1.64, (cum imperativo) 4.6, (in interrogatione) ὡc δή 4.103
(Δήλιοc) Δήλι᾽ 12.47, -ιοι 4.83
(Δῆλοc) Δῆλον 4.20
(δῆμοc) δήμου 1.76 δήμῳ 4.85
διακρίνω 4.72
(διαπλέω) διέπλευcα 13.5
(διδάcκω) κὴδίδαξε 1.61
(Διδυμεύc) Διδυμέοc 1.57
δίδωμι 1.68, -cι 1.77, ἔδωκε 3.27, *ἔ]δωκε 5.7, δοῦναι 1.67, ‡δ̣οῦcα 12.20
(δίκαζω) κὴδίκαζεν 4.67
δίκαιοc 2.6 δίκαι[α 2.6
(Δίκη) Δίκην 12.62
Δικτ[12.2
(δίκτυον) δικτύοιc 7.17
(δινέω) δινεῖν 1.34
δίc 1.77, 4.31, 6.39
‡διφθέρα 6.11
(δίφροc) δίφρον 5.28, ‡ δίφρα 13.36
Διω]νύcου 1.7
δοκέω 5.43, 13.33
δόμον 12.60
δόcιc 12.68, δόcει 12.24, -ιν 1.71, 12.65
δοῦλον 13.55
δρήcτηc 4.108
δρόμου 5.26
(δρῦc) δρῦν 4.65
(δύναμαι) *δύνηται 13.54
(δύο) (nom. fem.) δύ᾽ 4.61
(Δωριεύc) Δωριῆc 4.34
Δωριcτί 13.18
δῶρον 1.75
*δωτίνηc 12.46

ἐβδόμην 12.22
(ἐγείρω) *ἠγέρθη 4.94
ἐγχάcκει 1.82
ἐγχέουcι 13.20
ἐγώ 4.13, 4.19, 4.24, 4.49, *4.52, 4.57, 4.60, 5.31, 5.35, 12.55, 13.1 κὴγώ 1.68, 4.32 7.43, ἐμεῦ 4.16, μευ 4.21, 6.46, μοι 3.34, 4.61, 12.80, κὴμέ 13.53, με 1.34, 1.76, 3.17, 4.25, 4.34, 4.103, 5.30, 5.51, 7.17, 7.47, μ᾽ 4.39, ἠμέων 2.9, 4.1, 4.103
(ἔδαφοc) τοὔδα[φοc 1.69
εἰ 1.72, 5.42, 5.47, 13.15

(*εἴδω) εἶδον 5.49
εἴθ᾽ 3.1
(εἴκοσι) ἴκατιν 6.32
(εἴκω) εἶκ᾽ 12.79
*εἰληδόν 1.28
εἰμί 4.13, 4.37, 4.39, ἔμμι 7.2, ἐccί 6.45, ἐcτί 13.12, ἔcτιν 12.15, εἶναι 13.55, ἦν (1st. sing.) 3.1, ἦα 3.1, ἦν (3rd. sing.) 1.52, 1.53, 2.1, 3.34, 4.97, 13.48
(εἶπον) εἶπε(ν) 2.16, 3.28, 4.93, 4.102, 13.30, εἶπαν 7.45, εἰπών 4.31
(εἰc) ἐc 1.9, 1.39, 1.52, 1.75, 2.10, 3.38, 4.35, 4.52, 4.73, 4.95, 5.13, 6.26, 6.31, 6.32, 6.48, 13.52, ᾽c 4.32
εἷc 4.1, μί᾽ 4.103, ἕν 4.69, 4.75, 4.76, 4.77, 5.1
(εἴcω) ἔ]cω 12.48
εἴτ᾽ 13.16 (bis),
ἐκ 1.2, 1.27, 4.56, *7.51, 12.30, 13.11, 13.32, ἐξ 7.49, *κὴξ 5.11
ἕκαcτοc 1.80, 13.61
Ἑκάτη 1.28
ἐκβάλλ. . [12.32
ἐκεῖθεν 2.15
ἐκεῖνοc 1.74, 3.12, -αν 7.43, -ο 1.65 cf. κεῖνοc
(ἐκκνημόω) ἐξεκνήμωc. [3.33
(ἐκκόπτω) ἐξέκοψε 2.7
ἐκ . . . κυβιcτήcῃc 5.29
(ἐκπλέω) ἐκπλεύc[1.84
(ἔκπωμα) *τοὔκπωμα 1.66
ἔκφᾳ.[5.64
(ἐλαίη) ἠλαίη 4.87, ἐλαίηc 4.75, 4.80, 4.84, 13.62, -ῃ 4.7, ἐλαίην 4.66, 4.70, ἐλαίη (voc.) *4.18, 4.28, 4.40
(ἐλαύνω) ἔλαυνε 5.54
ἕλκει 4.25, -οντα 3.36
†ελων 1.83
ἐμβαίνειν 5.13
ἐμβεβ. . [13.37
(ἐμόc) οὐμόc 1.66, 5.55, -ῶν 4.46, -ή 12.68, ἐμαί 1.47, ἐμαῖc 7.44, (neutr.) ἐμόν 12.69
ἔμπηc 5.59
(ἐμπλέκω) ἐμπ[έ]πλεκται 13.17
ἐμπνεόντων 1.62
ἐν cum dat. nominis passim; nota usum ellipticum: 1.57, *οὐν 4.58, ᾽ν 4.59, τοὐν 2.2
ἐναύουcιν 3.25, ἐναύονται 13.14, 13.66
(ἕνεκα) c. gen. οὕνεκ᾽ 13.60, τοὕνεκ᾽ (= hanc ob rem) 12.18
ἔνθα 1.40 (bis)
(ἐνιαυτόc) οὐνιαυτόc 2.1
ἐντελέc 13.48
ἐντόc 1.12
(ἐντρέφω) οὐντραφείc 3.11
(ἐξαιρέω) *ἐξ[ελών 1.65
‡ἐξά[μετρον 13.43, ἐξ]άμετρα (aut πεντ]) 1.23
*ἐ]ξαερρας 7.14
ἐξεῖπ[ε 1.71
(ἐξευρίcκω) τοὐξεῦρ᾽ 1.59
ἐξόπιcθε 1.82
(ἐπαίρω) ἐπάραc 1.43
ἐπαντι. . .[5.44
ἐπαυρήcειc 5.15
ἐπεί *4.56, 5.3, ἐπήν 4.36, ἐπείπερ 3.18
ἔ]πειτ᾽ 1.46
ἐπί (c. gen.) 4.91, ταὐπί 2.4, (postposit.) ὦ ᾽πι 6.29, (c. acc.) 1.43, κὴπί 4.54, 4.88, 5.25, ἢ ᾽πί 4.32, 13.15, *᾽π᾽ 7.43, τοὐπι[1.84
(ἐπίβαθρον) τὠπίβαθρον 6.23
(ἐπίcταμαι) ἐπίcτανται 1.37
ἐπιχρίcῃ 4.74
(ἔποc) κἦποc 4.30
ἑπτά 1.68
(ἐπῳδή) ἐπῳδα[ῖc 7.44
ἐργάτηc 12.43, -την 5.10
(ἐρέω) ἐρεῖ 1.79 ἐροῦμεν 4.99
ἐρῆμοc 13.24
(ἐρίζω) *ἤριζε 4.66, ‡ἤρ[ι]cαν 12.23, *ἐρίζεcθε Dieg. VI 21
(ἔριc) ἔριν 12.45
ἐρίφοιc 12.70
Ἑρμᾶc 7.1, Ἑρμᾶ (voc.) 9.1
(ἑρπετόν) ἑρπετῶν 2.7
(ἔρχομαι) ἦλθε 12.41, ἐλθών 13.12, 13.64, ἦνθε 7.48, ἔνθ[ῃc 7.46
‡ἐ[cθλ]όc 1.39
(ἔcθω) ἔcθε 4.74
*ἐc]μεύουcιν 1.28
ἔcτ(ε) 4.95, ἔcτ᾽ 12.69
(ἑταίρη) ἑταίρην 1.20
(ἕτεροc) οὔτεροc 1.63, ἑτέρων 12.65, χἠτέροιc 2.9, τἠτέρῃ 1.70
ἔτι 2.4
(ἐτόc) *ἐτῆc 12.19
εὖ 12.66
εὐδαίμων 1.35
Εὔδημοc 2.10
Εὐθύδημον 3.24
(εὑρίcκω) εὑρίcκειν 13.28, εὗρ(εν) 1.56, 4.64, 4.66, 4.71
εὗροc 6.32
Εὔφορβοc 1.59

(εὐχή) εὐχῇ[ϲι 12.19
ἐφεδρ[ί]δοϲ 6.37
Ἔφεϲον 13.12, 13.13, 13.64, 13.65
(ἐφίημι) ἐφεῖτο 1.66
(ἐχθρόϲ) ἐχθροῖϲ 4.99
(ἔχω) -ει 4.117, -ουϲι 2.13, -ωϲιν 13.20, -όντων 2.9, εἶχε(ν) 1.36, 1.41, 1.63, ἔχε 5.33

ζεῦγοϲ 4.63
Ζεύϲ *2.6, 4.104, 6.1, 12.26, Δία 12.17, Ζῆνα 12.62, Ζᾶνα 1.10
ζοή 3.9
(ζώω) ἔζωϲε 1.39

ἤ (=vel, aut) et ἤ (=quam, post comparat.) passim, ἤ . . . ἤ 1.27, 4.32
ἦ = ἔφη v. ἠμί
ἤδη 1.38, 1.42
(ἡδύϲ) ἥδιϲτοϲ 4.110
ἥκω 1.1, -ειν 3.28
ἡλιοπλήξ 4.23
(ἧμαι) ‡ἧ[μεν]ο[ι 12.24
(ἡμέρα) ἡμέρην 12.22, ἡμέραϲ 1.37, *-αιϲ 3.28
(ἠμί) ἦ (= ἔφη) 7.47
ἧμοϲ 4.66
ἤν = ἐάν 1.78, κ[ἤ]ν 13.20
ἠνίκ(α) 1.38, 3.1, 4.52, 12.21
Ἥρη 12.22
*ῃ[ρῷο]ν 13.31
Ἡφαίϲτεια 12.57
‡Ἥφ]ᾳιϲ̣τοϲ 12.43

(θάλαϲϲα) θαλάϲϲαϲ 7.51, θαλάϲϲῃ 2.2, θάλαϲϲαν 2.12, 5.13
Θάληϲ 1.76, Θάλητοϲ 1.53, Θάλητ’ (acc.) 1.75
θαλλῷ 4.87
(θεά) θεαί 12.18, 13.50
(θέμιϲ) θέμιν 12.12, ‡12.62
θεόϲ 7.1, θεοί 1.37, *12.23, θεῶν 13.32, θεοῖϲι 1.50, ‡12.81, θεούϲ 3.32, 4.72, (θεόϲ (ἡ)) τῆϲ θεοῦ 3.37
θηρίον 7.21
Θηϲεύϲ 4.77
(θρίξ) τριχόϲ 12.69
(θρόνοϲ) θρόνω (dor.) 6.23
(θυγάτηρ) -τρόϲ 12.22
(θῦμα) θύματοϲ 1.27
θυμόϲ 4.93, -όν 13.15
(θυμόω) τεθύμωται 13.52
θύτηϲ 4.25
θωϊ̈ή 5.22

ἴαμβον 1.3, 1.21
Ἰαϲτί 13.18
(ἱδρύω) ἵδρυται 4.26
(ἱερόϲ) ἱρή 4.37, ἱραῖϲ 3.28, (τὸ ἱερόν subst.) ἱρόν 1.9, (τὰ ἱερά subst.) ἱρά 4.36, ἱρῶν 5.1
ἰηλεμίζειν 3.38
(ἰθύϲ) ἰθύ 6.26
(ἱκέτηϲ) ἱκέται 4.79
Ἰνδικοί 12.58
ἵπποϲ 12.40, -ουϲ 5.27
ἱπποτέκτονοϲ 7.3
Ἱππώνακτοϲ 1.1
(ἵϲτημι) ἔϲτηϲε 1.41, ἕϲτηκεν 4.109
ἱϲτίη 12.5
(ἴϲχω) ἴϲχε 5.26
(Ἰταλόϲ) Ἰταλοί 1.62
ἴχνιον 9.2
(Ἴωνεϲ) Ἰώνων 4.29, Ἴωϲι 13.11, 13.64

(κάθημαι) κάθηται 6.30, κάθηνται 4.63
καθίκ[ειν 1.38
καί passim, in crasi: κἄεθλον 4.33, *κἀνά 1.44, κἄπολλον 13.1, κἀποπλεῖν 1.97, κἀποτη . [7.11, καὐταί 13.59, κἠγώ 1.68, 4.32, 7.43, κἠμέ 13.53, κἠδίδαξε 1.61, *κἠξ 5.11, κ[ἤ]ν 13.20, κἠπί 4.54, 4.88, 5.25, κἦποϲ 4.30, καὶ_ἐρίφοιϲ 12.70 καὶ_ἑτέρων 12.65, χἠτέροιϲ 2.9 χὠ 4.77, 12.41, χὠπότ’ 4.40, κοὐ 4.39, 9.2, χ]ὑπό 4.42, *χὐ[πό 4.50,
καίπερ 12.66
(καίω) καίειν 4.41
(κακόϲ) κακή 4.102, κακαί 3.13, (acc. n.) κακόν ‡12.64, κακῶϲ 13.59
(καλέω) καλεύϲιν 4.76
καλλίνικοϲ 4.87
(καλόϲ) καλή 4.46, καλαί 13.1, καλάϲ 13.29, (neutr.) καλόν 12.83, (nom. neutr.) καλόν 4.9, (acc. neutr.) καλά 12.57, καλῶϲ 2.17, καλλίϲτῃ 12.68, *καλλίϲτῃ 12.24, *κ[άλλιϲτον 4.46, ‡κάλ]λιϲτον 12.64, κάλλιϲτα 12.9
(κάμνω) κάμοιμι 4.48
(κάμπτω) -ει 4.38, κάμψηϲ 5.27
καπηλεῦϲ[αι 1.89
καρδ[ίηϲ 5.2
καρπόϲ 4.73
κάρτ’ 3.2
κάρτοϲ 2.8
κατά 7.15
κατάγρ[7.50
(καταυλέω) κα]τηύληϲθ’ 1.7
*καταψήχων 1.70

κεῖμαι 4.54, κεῖται 4.80, κεῖcθαι 3.7, ἔκειτο 12.49
κεῖνοc 2.1, κείνουc 13.50
]κ̣ειναθη 5.21
κενόν 12.16
κέπφ[οι 1.6
κέραc 13.52
(κεραυνόω) κεραυνώcη 5.20
κηρύccει 1.80
(κληρόω) ἐκληρώcω 13.32
κλιντῆροc 1.41
*κλίνων 5.17
‡κλῖτοc 12.82
(κοιμάω) κοίμηcον 5.26
κολλύβου 1.2
κολυμβάc (oliva) 4.77
(κόμη) κόμην 3.35
κονδύλῳ 1.89
(κόπτω) κόψαc 13.27
κόρ[12.28
κορώνη 4.82
κοτε 4.6
*κοτέω]ν 13.53
‡κουρ]οτρόφε 12.81
*κρᾶcιν 13.20
κρέccων 4.57
κρηγύωc 3.30
(Κρής) Κρῆτα 12.16
Κρήcιον 12.82
Κρηταῖον 12.1
Κρόνου 2.4
κρούων 4.30
κτείνει 12.17
*κτη]μάτων 12.49
*Κυβήβῃ 3.35
(κύκλοc) κύκλον 1.61
κύκνοc 4.47
κ]ύμβαλοι 4.106
κύμβαχοc 5.29
κύπειρον 4.65
(κῦcοc) κυcω 1.98
κύων 1.83, κυνός 2.10, κύνεc 12.58
(κώνειον) κωνήῳ 1.57
Κωρυκαῖοc 1.82
κῶc v. πῶc
κωτιλίζουcι 4.81
κωτίλον 4.63
(κωφεῦc) κωφεῖ 5.34

λαγός 6.22
λαίδρη 4.82
λαλάζων 1.11
λαλευc[13.17
λάλοι 2.14
(λαμβάνω) λάβοι 5.22, λαβών 1.77
*λαοῖc 4.30
λέγω *5.18, λέγουcι 3.16, 4.8, λέγων 12.15, ‡λέγουcα 2.5, ἔλεξεν 4.97, ἐλέγετο 1.54
(λεπτός) *λεπ[τῶ 7.42
λεcχαίνειc 13.40
λευκός 4.22, -ήν 4.52 -άc 1.37
(λήγω) ἔληγ’ 7.41
(λῃϊcτός) *λῃιcτῆ̣ς[12.39
ληκῆcαι 3.10
Λητώ (acc.) 4.84, 13.62
λιμηρά 13.60
λίχνοc 6.45
λογιcτόν 6.47
λόγοc 5.34, *-οιc 1.72
Λυδιεργές 6.29
(Λυδός) -όν *13.47, -οί 4.7
λύκοι 12.70
λώβη 4.102
(λωΐον) λῷcτε 1.33, λῷcτ’ 13.24

μά (οὐ μά) 4.105 (bis), 4.106
μᾶζα 5.7
(μακρός) (acc. m. aut n.) μακρόν 1.39, -ήν 1.32, (acc. n.) -όν 6.31, μάccων 6.38
μάλ(α) 4.45
(μανθάνω) *μανθάνοντεc 1.88
μάντιc 4.25, μάντειc 4.90
(μαργάω) μαργῶνταc 5.27
μάργοc 3.38
(μάccω) ἔμαξα 3.39
μάcταξ 4.75
(μαcτός) μαcτόν 5.21
μάχην 1.3
(μέγαc) μέγα (adv.) 1.34, μέζων 4.58, 4.94
μεδεῦντι 1.76
μειονεκτεῖν 6.44
μελ̣[12.20
(μέλλω) μέλλωcι 4.41, μέλλοντεc 13.13, 13.65, μέλλονταc 1.42, ἤμελλεν 1.38
μέν . . . δέ passim
(μέccοc) (neutr.) μέcον 1.34
(μεταcτρέφω) μετέcτραπται 3.9
(μέτρον) μέτρα 13.13, 13.65
μέχρι 13.19
μή passim; synaloephe: μὴ ἀμαθώc 13.14, 13.66
μηδ(έ) 4.99, 5.17, 5.27, 5.48
μήτ(ε) 4.74 (ter)
μήτηρ 3.24
(μικκός) μικκῇ 12.20

Μίλητον 1.52
*μιμειcθ. . [12.77
*Μιμν[εῖον 13.7
‡Μίμν[ερμοc 13.7
(μιμνήcκομαι) ἐμνήcθηc 4.56
μιν v. οὗ
μόλιc 1.43, *12.72
(μόνοc) μοῦνοc 1.92, *μοῦνον 13.43
Μοῦcα 1.17, *12.20, Μοῦcαι 13.1, 13.22, Μουcέων 1.8, Μούcαc 1.92, 3.38, 13.26
μόχθηροc 3.33
μῦθοc 7.41, μῦθον 2.17, μύθοιcι 12.37
(μυίηc) μυῖαι 1.26
(μυρίοc) μυρίην 12.34
(μύρμηξ) μύρμηκεc 12.59

(Νείλεωc) Νείλεω 1.76
νεῖκοc 4.7, 4.95
(νεκρός) νεκρόν 4.40
νέρθεν 4.68
νεῦρον 9.1
(νεύω) ἔνευcα 3.39
νήθουcαι 12.9
νηcτεύειν 1.61
(νικάω) νικάτω 12.75, νικήcει 12.57
νίκη 1.52
(Νίκη) Νίκα 6.39
(νόοc) νοῦν 13.20
(νύμφη) νύμφα (voc.) 12.73
νῦν 1.6, 3.38, (τὰ νῦν) 13.40
νύccῃ 5.28

(ξένοc) ξεῖνε 5.1
(ξυνός) ξυνόν 4.72
(ξύω) ξύοντα 1.58

(ὁ, ἡ, τό) artic. passim; synaloephe: *ὁ ᾽Αρκ[άc 1.44, οἱ ἱκέται 4.79, οἱ ᾽Ιταλοί 1.62; in crasi χὠ 4.77, 12.41, θῴγιον 6.29, ὠγών 4.58, ὠνηρ 7.4, ὥνθρωποc 3.12, ὡριcτερός 4.22, οὐμός 1.66, 5.55, *οὐν 4.58, οὐνιαυτός 2.1, οὐντραφείc 3.11, οὔτεροc 1.63, οὐλαφηφόροc 4.38, τὠπιόντοc 1.47, τὠπόλλωνοc 4.36, *τᾧνυχι 13.21, ὦνδρεc 1.26, ἠλαίη 4.87, τὴτέρῃ 1.70, τὠγαθόν 3.31, τᾧνιγμα 5.33, τὠνέκαυcαc 5.23, τοὔδα[φοc 1.69, τοὺν 2.2, τοὐξεῦρ᾽ 1.59, τὠπίβαθρον 6.23, τοὐλόχρυcον 1.65, τἀπό 5.2
ὄγχνην 4.88
(ὅδε, ἥδε, τόδε) ‡τόνδε 13.33, τώνδ᾽ 12.13, τῆcδ᾽ 12.19, (nom.) τόδ᾽ 4.72, τοῦδ᾽ 13.60, τάδ(ε) (acc.) *4.44, 4.102, *12.53
ὁδόν 4.54
ὅθεν 13.13, 13.65
ὀθνεῖα 5.50
οἶδ(α) 4.38
(οἰκέω) οἰκεῦμεν 3.8, οἰκήcει 12.60, *ο[ικέων 4.20, *ο̣ἰ[κεύντων 2.12
οἶκοc 4.24
(οἷοc) οἷον 5.5, οἷα 4.81, 4.101
*οἰχνεῖ 5.25
ὁκοῦ v. ὁποῦ
ὁκόcοc v. ὁπόcοc
ὅκωc v. ὅπωc
(ὁλόχρυcοc) τοὐλόχρυcον 1.65
᾽Ολυμπίῃ 4.58
῞Ολυμπον 12.23
ὁμαρτέω 4.54
ὁμιλεῖν 13.58
ὀνήϊcτοc *1.67, ὀνήϊcτον 3.34, ὀνήιcτον 5.4
(ὄνοc) ὄνου 2.11
(ὄνυξ) *τᾧνυχι 13.21
(ὁποῖοc) *ὁκ[οίη]ν 4.38
(ὁπόcοc) ὁκόcοι 1.16
(ὁπότε) χὠπότ᾽ ἄν (c. coni.) 4.40
(ὅπου) ὅκου 1.2
(ὅπωc) ὅκωc 1.30
(ὁράω) ὁρᾷ 1.78, ὄψεαι 5.51
(ὀργίζω) *ὠ̣[ργίcθη 4.29
ὀργυιαιᾶν 6.43
(ὄρνιc) ὄρνιθεc 4.61
(ὄροc) ὄρευc *5.11, ὀρέων 4.35, οὔρεα 12.8
(ὄρπηξ) ὄρπηκαc 4.10
(ὅc, ἥ, ὅ) passim, synaloephe ἣ ἀν[έπαυc]ε 4.84, ὃc τ(ε) 1.53, ἥ τ(ε) 12.2
(ὅcοc) μηδ᾽ ὅccον 5.48, ὅccον οὐδέ 6.43, *ὅcca 12.48
ὅcπερ v. περ
ὅcτιc 1.18, 1.21, 1.24, 1.59, ὅντιν᾽ 2.16, ἥτιc 12.57, 13.12, ἅccα 5.18
ὅταν 1.83
οὐ, οὐκ, οὐχ passim; οὐκ interrog c. ind. fut. 4.98, οὐχί 4.37, 13.43, in crasi κοὐ 4.39, 9.2
οὗ (pron. pers.) μιν 1.64, 4.86
οὐδ(έ) locis lacunosis aut init. fragm. 3.25, 5.55, (altera negatione praecedente), 4.38, 6.47, οὐδ(έ) = ‘ne . . . quidem’ 1.33, 1.88, 13.21, (οὐδ᾽ ὅccον) 6.43
οὐδείc 13.33, οὐδέν (acc.) 13.60, (adv.) 4.61,
οὐκέτ(ι) 4.44
οὐλαφηφόροc 4.38

οὖν 13.16, ὦν 6.45
οὔτ(ε) 4.91, 5.49, οὔτ(ε) . . . οὔτ(ε) 4.60, 13.*11–12, 13.64
οὗτος *1.38, 1.78, 13.41, τοῦτον 12.85, τοῦτ(ο) (nom.) 3.34, 13.17, (acc.) *1.66, 1.77, 4.57, 4.104, ταῦτα 4.100, *5.58, (acc.) 2.15, 4.62
οὕτως 13.23, οὕτω 4.48
ὄφις 4.68

Πάγχαιον 1.10
(παίγνιον) παίχνια 12.28, 12.33
(παιδεύω) ἐπαιδεύθην 3.30
(παίζω) παίσαντες 12.63
(παῖς) πάϊς 5.12, παῖδ[α, παῖ 4.1, *12.24 παῖδες 1.47, 4.53, παῖδας 4.28, παῖς (ἡ) παιδός 12.39, παιδί 12.68, *12.75
Πακτωλόν 4.106
πάλαι 1.10, 1.35, 4.7, 4.63
Παλαίμονες 7.19, 7.23
παλασταί 6.28
παλίμπρητον 13.55
πάλιν 1.75
Παλλάς 4.66, 4.71
παρ(ά) c. dat. 1.26, 4.24
(παραπέτομαι) παρέπτησαν 13.58
πάρεργον 7.3
(παρθένος) παρθένοι 6.42, -οις 1.42
(πᾶς) πάντες 1.63, 2.13, πάντων 4.13, πάντα (acc. pl.) 1.36, 12.42 (?), (adv.) 4.46
*πάσσαλον 6.43
(πατέω) πατεῦσι 4.39
πατήρ 1.66, 6.61, 12.26
(πατρῷος) πατρῷον 12.17
(παύω) παυσόμεσθα 4.98
πέδον 12.1
(πείθω) πίθησθε 1.95
(πέμπω) πέμπουσιν 5.57
πεντάμετρον 13.45, -α *1.23, 13.31
πέντε 6.25, 6.37
πέπλον 1.91, 13.25
περ (οὖπερ) 4.24, (ὅθεν περ) 13.13, 13.65
περί c. gen (postposit.) *12.46; c. dat. 5.28; loc. lacunos. 12.82
(περιβάλλω) *π[ε]ρβαλον 7.50
περιστέλλειν 4.41
Περφεραῖος 7.1
πεύκην 4.65
πηλός 2.3
πῆμα 4.37
*πήρης 1.65
(πῆχυς) παχέεσσι 6.38
(πίνω) πίνῃ 1.83, πῖνε 4.74, *ἔπωνε 4.77
πιπρήσκουσιν 1.2
(πίπτω) πέπτωκε 4.69
(Πῖσα) Πῖσαν 6.12
(Πιτθεύς) Πιτθέως 5.33
(πίων) πῖον 13.60
(πλάσσω) πλάσας 1.10
(πλατύνω) ἐπλάτυνται 6.24
πλευρά 4.42
(πλέω) πλέουσι 1.55, ἔπλευσεν 1.52
(πλῆθος) πλήθευς 1.28
(πνέω) πνέοντος 4.43, *πνευς. [13.15
(πνοή) πνοήν 1.29
ποδαρε. [13.10
ποδήρες 3.36
(ποιέω) *ποιεῦσα 4.48, ποιεῦντα 5.52, ἐποίησε(ν) 3.6, 4.31, ποιήσῃ 5.30, ποιήσαι 4.103, πε]ποιήσθω 4.111
ποικίλα 12.27
(πόλις) πόλεις 12.7
πολῖται 4.85
(πολλάκι) πολλάκις 3.20, 12.60
(πολύμυθος) πουλύμυθοι 2.14
(πολύς) πολλούς 1.25, πολλῇ 5.23, πολλήν 13.40, πολλά loc. lacunos. 13.26, (acc.) 12.27, 12.29, 12.36, (adv.) τὰ πολλά 4.23, πλεῖον 4.55, *12.81
(πόντος) πόντον 7.47
(ποτε) κοτε 4.6
πότης 1.43
(πούς) ποδί 5.19, 12.63, *πο]δῶν 6.25, πόδας 12.71
(πραΰς) πρηεῖαι *12.18
πρέμνον 4.83
*πρέσβυς 1.69
πρῖνον 4.65
πρό c. gen. 1.9, 2.4
Προμήθειος 2.3
πρός (c. acc.) 1.15, 1.64, *3.36, 13.47 ποτ(ί) 7.39, 9.2, ποττάν 9.2
πρόσθεν 4.94
πρόσω 5.24, 12.67
προτείνουσι 4.79
Προυσέληνο[ς] 1.56
*πρωτῆον 1.68
πρῶτος 1.60, loc. lacunos. τὰ πρῶτα 3.16
(πτερόν) πτεροῖς 12.59
πτηνόν 2.1
πτῶμα 4.78
Πυθαϊστήν 4.33
Πυθίη 4.26
(Πυθών) Πυθῶνος 12.48
πυλωρός 12.29
(πυνθάνομαι) πυθέσθαι 6.46
πῦρ (acc.) 3.25, 5.23

πυρδάνω 7.42
(πῶc) κῶc 4.57, 4.82

(ῥᾴδιοc) ῥᾳδίωc 12.35
(ῥέζω) ῥέξω 1.49
ῥῆcιc 13.24, -ει 4.93, -ιν 1.31
(ῥίπτω) ἔρριψαν 7.49
(ῥόοc) ῥῥόον 7.15

Cαρδιηνόc 2.16
*cαυνιαcτά[c 7.48
(cείω) cείcαcα 4.10
Cίβυλλα 5.31
cίμαινε 1.33
cίττῃ 1.56
(cιωπή) cωπή 1.31, 4.59
cκαληνά 1.60
Cκάμανδροc 7.13
cκέπαρνον 7.4
(cκέπτομαι) ‡cκέψαι 13.33
cκίπωνι 1.69
cμίλῃcιν 12.66
Cόλων 1.74
(cοφόc) -ῶν 1.67, -ήc 12.56
cπένδω 13.1
*cπλάγχνα 3.27
cταθμήcαcθαι 1.54
cτέγην 1.44
*cτέμφυλον 4.76
(cτέφω) ἔcτεφεν 4.86, *cτέψει 12.44
cτίζει 13.56
cύ 1.72, 3.2, 4.1, 4.55, 4.103, 12.47, 13.31 (bis), 13.32, 13.38, τύ 7.46, cεῦ 4.58, coί 1.68, 4.40, τοι 5.18, 5.28, 5.31, 5.43, 9.1, 12.48, c(é) 4.56, 4.60, 5.3, 5.22, 12.4, 12.44, 12.73, 13.19, ὑμέων 1.67, ὑμῖν 3.11
cῦκα 1.93
(cυμβάλλω) cυμβαλεῦ 5.32
cυμβουλή 5.1
cύμμικτον 13.18
(cυμμείγνυμι) cυμμείξαc 13.11, 13.64
cυμπαιζ] 5.38
cύν 1.50
(cυναντάω) cυναντήcαc 3.26
cυνέκ . . . πέμπω 4.50
(cυντίθημι) cυντίθει 13.31
(cφήξ) cφῆκεc 1.27
cχῆμα 1.58
cχολάζω 1.34

(τάλαc) τάλαινα 4.15, τάλαιναι 4.98
ταῦροc 4.101
(τάφοc) *[τά]φ[φ] 4.41, τάφον 4.52, 12.16
τ(ε) 1.37, 4.42, τε καί 2.4, *4.64, *θ' . . . καί 4.54, τε . . . καί 1.53, 4.30, 4.50, τε . . . καί . . . καί 2.1, loc. lacunos. 4.9, 6.48, 12.2, 12.30, 13.48
τεθμόc 13.41
(τεῖχοc) τείχευc 1.9, τειχέων 4.96
(τελευτή) τελευτῇ 4.47
(τέμνω) τέμνουcιν 4.34
Τεμπέων 4.56, Τεμπόθεν 4.34
τετράδωρα 6.27
*τετράκιν 6.25
τετράπουν 2.2
(τέφρη) τέφρην 5.25
(τέχνη) τέχνα 6.1, τέχνηc 12.56
τεχνήεντα 12.27
(Τηθύc) Τηθύν 4.52
τίθημι 4.78, θέντεc 12.46, θέcθαι 3.29, 4.8 ‡θ]έcθ' 12.55
Τιθωνόν 4.53
(τίκτω) τίκτειν 13.14, 13.66, τεκοῦcα 4.45, τέξομαι 12.78
(τιμάω) τιμᾷ 4.70, τιμήcει 12.25, ‡ἐτίμᾶcθε 3.2
(τιμήεccα) *τιμηέcτερα 12.33
(τίμιοc) τιμίη . [12.3, τίμιον 12.64
τινθυρίζουcαι 4.62
τίc (interrog.) 4.24, 4.25 (bis), 4.64, 4.66, 4.70 (bis), 12.24, 13.30 τεῦ 4.79, *4.83, 13.19, τί 4.73 (bis), (adv. = 'cur') 9.1, τίc (pro relativo) 1.67
τιc 1.13, 1.22, 1.35, 1.78, 12.86, τιν' 4.89, 12.55, τι 5.1, 5.47, 12.20, (pro adv.) 13.15
Τμώλῳ 4.6
τοίγαρ 3.39
(τοκεών) *τοκεῶνοc 1.72
(τολμάω) τολμᾷc 13.19
*τομόν 4.30
τραγῳδε[ῖν 13.32
(τραγῳδόc) τραγῳδοί 2.12, -ούc 13.44
‡τράπ[εζαν 13.36
τράχηλα 1.86
(τραχύc) τρηχύ 4.96
(τρεῖc) τρί' 4.80
(τρέπω) *τρέψῃ 5.19
(τρίβων) τρίβωνα 1.30
τρίγωνα 1.60
τρίπουc 12.51
τρίc 4.31, 6.31
]τριτη . 13.7
Τριτωνίc 12.28
τρομεῦcαι 13.59
] . τροφε 12.81
(τρώγω) τρώγειν 3.15, τρωγούcαc 1.93

Τυρcην. [12.31
(τύπτω) *ἔτυψε 1.69
τυφεδῶνα 13.40
*τυχαμπυριξ. [(?) 7.40

ὑγιείηc 13.21
(ὕδροc) ὕδρου 4.22
ὕλην 5.11
ὑμήν 12.11
(ὑπακούω) ὑπήκουcαν 1.62
ὑπήνην 1.70, -αν 9.2
ὑπ(ό) (c. acc.) χ]ὑπό 4.42, *χὺ[πό 4.50
ὑποδράξ 4.101
(ὑποcτορέννυμι) *ὑπέcτρωcαν 4.43, ὑπέcτρωται 4.27
ὑπτίῳ 12.63
ὑπώροφοι 12.52

(φαύλοc) (acc. m.) φαῦλον 12.60, φαύλοιc 13.58, φαύλη 4.13, *φαυλ[12.14
Φειδίαc 6.59, Φειδία 6.1, 6.61
(φέρω) φέρουcι(ν) 4.35, 4.53, φέρων 1.3, *οἴcουcι 12.59, ἤνεικεν 12.28
φεῦ *1.35 (bis), 3.17, 4.81 (c. gen.), 5.58
(φεύγω) φεῦγ(ε) 1.79 (bis)
φηγόc 5.32
φημί 4.92, φηcί 1.84, 12.17, 13.55, φαντί 6.44, φήcει 1.78, ἔφηcα 3.26, ἔφηcε *1.46, 1.64
(φθέγγομαι) ἐφθέγγεθ’ 2.3, *ἐφθέγξω 12.53
*φθέ[γμα 2.7
φθόρον 7.25
(φίλοc) φίλον 3.29, φίλοι 13.19
Φίλτων 2.11
φἰμόν 5.67
(φλιά) φλιῆc 4.91, φλιῇ 4.24
(φλόξ) φλογί 5.24
Φοῖβοc 4.29, Φοῖβον 4.105, Φοῖβε 3.10, 12.56
(Φοῖνιξ de gente Phoenicia) Φοίνικεc 1.55
(φοιτάω) *φ[οιτῶc]αι 12.82
φοιτέω 4.32, φοιτέων 12.67
(φρονέω) φρονέων 5.14, *ἐ]φρόνηcα 3.31
Φρύξ 1.59, Φρύγ[α] 3.36
φυγαίχμα 7.2
φυκιοίκῳ 4.67
(φυλάccω) φυλάccουcι 4.83
φύλλον 4.79, -οιc 4.62
(φυcάω) φυcέων 1.30
(φύω) *πεφύκαcιν 2.14
(φωνή) φωνήν 2.13

(χαίρω) χαίρωcιν 12.70, χαῖρ’ 3.26
(χάριc) χάριν 12.81
Χαριτάδεω 4.1
*χαρταί 4.98
(Χάρων) Χάρωνοc 1.96
χείλοc 4.82
χείρων 4.112
χελύναν 6.22
(χθών) χθονόc 12.10
Χίλων’ 1.74
χλωρά 1.93
χορδάc 13.47
χορόν 4.32
(χράω) χρήcωμαι 4.73
χρείην 5.33
χρεώ 12.56
χρή 12.84
χρηcτόν 4.60
χρῆμα 13.48
χρῖμα 4.45, 4.76
χρόνοc 12.67
χρύcιον 6.23
χρυcόc 12.61, χρυcοῖο 12.33, χρυcόν 6.48, 12.58, 12.64
χωλά 13.14, 13.66
(χωρέω) κεχώρηκεν 5.24

ψαύειc 13.21
(ψῆφοc) ψῆφοι 3.13
ψήχει 1.11
ψιλοκόρcηc 1.29
ψιττακοῦ 2.11
(ψοθέω) ψοθεῦcιν 4.106

ὦ 1.33, 1.47 (bis), 4.46, 4.98, 4.102, 5.1, 7.19, 7.23, 12.9, 13.24, se ipse alloquitur Apollo ὦ Φοῖβε 12.56, ὦ post voc. posit. 9.1, synaloephe ὦ Ἑκάτη 1.28, ὦ ἐμαί 1.47; in crasi: ὠγαθή 12.86 ὠνδρόνικε 2.15, ὤνδρεc 1.6, ὤπολλον 1.26, 3.1, 12.47, ὤφρων 4.18, 4.28, 4.40
ὦδ(ε) 1.64
(ὥρα) ὥρη 1.97
Ὧραι 6.42
ὡc ‘sicut’ 1.26, 1.43, 1.81, 1.83, 2.3, 4.22, *4.47, 4.65 (quater), 4.103, 5.4, 5.40, 13.62, coniunctio temp. ‘quum’ *13.21, praeposit. c. acc. 1.74
ὥc 4.93, 5.22
ὥcπερ 2.8, *3.24, 13.27
ὥcτ’ 13.57

General Index

Note: cn. refers to a commentary note; n. refers to a footnote in the text.

Abbruchsformel, 52, 243
abuse: Callimachus' use of specific term of, "babbling" 80, 184, 187, 202; —, "dog," 56; —, γαστήρ, 80; —, κορυκαῖος, 56n.75; conventional topics of, in iambic poetry, insanity, 75, 80–81; —, low birth 67cn.54–56, 75, 79; the laurel's, of the olive as "low," 200. *See also* animals; censure; sound (harsh); violence
"academics," 46, 184; Callimachus' presentation of his contemporary, 145, 150. *See also* Euhemerus; schoolteachers; Seven Sages; teachers; Thales
Acontius, and Cydippe, 234–35
Adonis, in *Iambus* 3, 221, 242, 245–47
advisor. *See under* poetic voice
Aeolic dialect: elements of, in Iambus 7, 63cn.18, 266, 272, 295
Aesop: in *Aetia* fr. 1, 174; in the fifth century, 172–73, 197; figured as Alexandrian poet, 153; as former slave, 201; in *Iambi* 1 and 2, 8; in *Iambus* 4, 197–98; as model for Callimachus, 173–74; in the structuring of the *Iambi*, 8
aesthetic criticism: *See under* criticism
Aetia (poem), and the *Iambi*, *3,* 4, 6, 44, 174
agon: in *Amores* 3.1, 192; of Athena and Poseidon, 202; contest of *sophia* in *Iambus* 12, 135, 138n.39; in the *Frogs,* 192; of *Iambus* 4, 84, 100, 191, 199–204; *Iambus* 13's character of, 100; as medium for literary criticism, 191, 201, 204
Ainos, 294. See also *Iambus* 7
Alcaeus, 219
Alcmeon, 54, 80
Alexandria: in the *Iambi*, 191; *Mouseion* of, 1, 45–46, 145; *Sarapeion* of, 146, 189–90
alphabet. *See* literacy
Amnisus, 121
amphidromia, 120
anachronism, 176, 183, 189–90. *See also* juxtaposition
animals: Callimachus as cicada in *Aet.* (fr. 1 Pf.), 174; and Callimachus' zoological terminology in *Iambus* 2, 176–80; voices of, compared with human, 43, 48, 56, 174, 184, 187–88. *See also entries for individual animals*; fable; swarms
Andronicus, in *Iambus* 2, 183
ants (Indian gold-digging), 140
Apollo: in *Aetia* fr. 1, 44, 142; as Callimachaean poet, 134, 142; as craftsman, 95, 136–37; and Cyrene 137n.36; and his eternal youth, 141; and gold, 137–41, 291; in *Iambus* 3, 206–7cn.2, 223, 226; in *Iambus* 4, 199–202; in *Iambus* 12, 122, 125–27, 133; in *Iambus* 13, 74; as patron of poets, 136–37; as poet, 134, 136, 151; song of, in *Iambus* 12, 120, 134–43; as source of inspiration for Callimachus, 44; as source of validation for Callimachus, 143; and swans, 180–81. *See also* Didyma; Muses
Apollonius of Rhodes, 129–30, 256, 291–92
apostrophe, 49, 51–52, 183–84, 256; hymnic, 70, 133, 134

Archilocheion, 282–83
Archilochus, 1–2, 16, 19; as advisor, 262–63; and Callimachus, 248, 263; in the *Grapheion*, 188n.53; and Hipponax, 74; in Horace's *Epodes*, 10; and *Iambus* 5, 251–52; memorialization of, through poetry, 282–84; oracular voice in, 262; *See also* iambic poetry, characteristics of archaic
Arete, 248
Argonautica. *See* Apollonius of Rhodes
Aristaenetus, 14n.26
Aristophanes: and Aesop, 172; *Frogs*, 192
art objects, description of. *See under* statuary
Artemis, in *Iambus* 12, 121–22, 126–27, 133
asses, 43, 174, 188
assemblies of the gods, 124–26
astronomy. *See* constellations
Athena: contest of Poseidon and, 202; discovery of the olive by, 192; in *Iambus* 12, 125, 129–32; and the *Palladion* in *Hymn* 5, 284–85
Athenis, 32–33, 35, 281
authority, poetic, 99; of Aesop, 174, 190; of Apollo, 70, 143; the cultural past and, 174, 204; derived from Hesiod, 97, 99; derived from Ion of Chios, 89, 95; evocation of by the Seven Sages, 144; Hipponactean voice as, 21, 76, 190; of the Muses, 70, 96; through evocation of *Hymn* 4, 102; use of heightened paradigm to achieve, 152

Bacchylides, 174
Bathycles, deathbed of, 146–48; compared to paradigm of *Iambus* 12, 104–5, 138; compared to paradigm of *Iambus* 13, 88, 96; parable of cup of, 5, 18–19, 36, 48–49, 76; Leandrius of Miletus as source of Callimachus' version, 144; possibly recounted by Hipponax, 143–44. *See also* Phoenix of Colophon
bees, 49, 89
beetles, 50
Berenice: lock of (Callim. *Aetia* 4), 123–24; victory of (Callim. *Aetia* 3), 123–24
Bias of Priene, 144
birthday celebration, poetry of, 7, 120–21, 124. See *Iambus* 12
Boeotia, 264
books. *See* literacy; poetry books
Branchus, in *Iambus* 4, 11, 191–92, 200
Bupalus and imagery of violence, 34; in Hipponax, 32–35, 55, 74, 208cn.33, 248, 281; imagery of, in *Iambus* 1, 38–40

Cabiri of Samothrace, 296, 302
Callimachus: and adaptation of Hipponactean poetic voice, 17–18, 37–40, 143; and Aesop, 173–74; and Apollo, 44, 134, 142–43; and Archilochus, 248; craftsmanship as metaphor in the poetry of, 93–95; and Cyrene, 130; and ecphrasis, 265; etiology, use of by, 184, 286, 301; fable in, 19, 173–75; gender fluidity in, 242–43; genre, manipulation of, 192; Hipponax, evocation of, 21, 38, 60; —, refashioning of, 21; homoeroticism in, 224–25, 233–42, 249; and inspiration, divine, 44, 224, 247–48; juxtaposition in, 58, 80, 104, 290–91, 296, 298; and Leon in *Iambus* 12, 121, 129; and Miletus, 11; objects in, 58, 280–81, 298; and Plato, 86n.36, 142, 233, 237, 239; poetic voice in, 259–60; —, ambiguity of, 40, 46–47, 53, 264; and *polyeideia*, 7, 12, 68cn.34, 84; portrayal of contemporaries in, 145, 150; possibly a schoolmaster in early life, 257, 259; and poverty, 225–29, 232, 248; as rejected erastes, 233, 244–47, 249–51; self-portrayal as cicada in *Aet.* fr. 1, 174; self-reference in, 53, 99–102, 122, 191, 194
Catullus, 248n.77
censure (in iambic poetry): in the *Iambi* generally, 266; in *Iambi* 3, 5, and 9, 303; in *Iambus* 3, 248–49; in *Iambus* 5, 252; of sexual misbehavior, 205. *See also* abuse
Cercidas, 3
Charitades, 193, 199, 203
Charon, 40n.29
children: in Callimachus, 123–24; in fifth-century tragedy and epic, 124
choliambic, Callimachus' use of, 5, 21. *See also under* meter
cicadas, 174
Cleon of Curion, 256
conch shell, in *Epigram* 5, 286–88
constellations: Little Dipper, 149n.67
contest. *See* agon

Court, Alexandrian. *See* Alexandria
craftsmanship: and Apollo, 136–37; and Athena, 130; in Hellenistic poetry, 131; in Herodas, 130; as metaphor for poetry in Callimachus, 93–95, 95n.62
Crete, in *Iambus* 12, 121–22, 143, 267
criticism: aesthetic 21; —, in Hipponax, 35; —, in Hipponax and Archilochus, 280–84; ethical (irregular eating, thievery, oath-breaking) in Hipponax and Archilochus, 21, 34, 218–21; iambic poetry as vehicle for, 34. See *Iambus* 3; *Iambus* 4; *Iambus* 5; literary criticism
critics: as poetic foil, 76; portrayal of (*see* abuse)
crows, 174; in *Iambus* 4, 191, 202–3
Cumae, 264
Cybele: cult and priests of (see also *Galli*) in *Iambus* 3, 8, 221, 225, 242, 245–47; in Hipponax, 245–46; in *Iambus* 4, 204; in the structuring of the *Iambi*, 8
Cynics, 56
Cyrene, 130; and Callimachus, 92; the rape of the nymph, 142

Daphnephoria, 200
death: and the olive in *Iambus* 4, 202; scene of Bathycles', 148; as topic in *Iambus* 11, 8
Delphi, 190, 264
Demeter, in *Iambus* 12, 131–33
Demetrius of Phalerum, 173, 197
Demodocus, 229
Demosthenes, circulation of smaller speeches of, 13
dialect: as organizing structure in the *Iambi*, 8, 266; variation of in the *Iambi*, 63cn.18, 266. *See also under specific dialects*
didacticism, in *Iambi* 1 and 13, 21
Didyma: cult of Apollo at, 116cn.60, 150, 191; re-foundation under Ptolemy II, 150
diegesis: characteristics of, 14, 45n.43, 186, 193–96, 258, 303n.69; papyrus of, 13–14. See also *P. Mil.* I 18
Diogenes the Cynic, 56
Dionysus: cult rituals of, 246; in *Iambus* 1, 43–44; in *Iambus* 12, 131–33; *Phallen*, 297
displacement: in *Iambi* generally, 267; in *Iambus,* 13, 61, 76; as shared experience of Callimachus and Ion of Chios, 92
distance: common in the beginnings of parables, 147; geographical, imagery of, 6, 19, 280, 290; in references to Lydia, 292; temporal, imagery of, 6, 59, 60, 280
Dodona, 264
dogs, 56, 110cn.58, 188
Doric (dialect): in *Iambus* 6, 268, 295; in *Iambus* 7, 272, 295; in *Iambus* 9, 278; literary, 5, 17, 63cn.18, 266

ecphrasis, 280; in Callimachus, 265; popularity of in Hellenistic period, 294; tradition of, 294. *See also* statuary
education, 178. *See also* literacy; *paideia;* teachers
Epeius, 298n.55
Ephesus, imagery of in *Iambus* 13, 5, 61
epic, 99
Epigram 5 (Callimachus), 124, 286–88
epigrams: conventions of homoerotic, 249–50; dedicatory, 286, 295
epinician, 1, 11. See also *Iambus* 8
erastes: conventional portrayal of, 249–50; in *Iambus* 9, 300–3; and mercenary *eromenoi,* 225, 249; rejected in Callimachus, 233–42, 244–47, 249–51. *See also* poetic voice
Eratosthenes of Cyrene, 46
Eris, Callimachus' allusion to Hesiod's portrayal of, 98
eromenoi, mercenary, 249
eros: in *Iambus* 5, 263; standard metaphors for, 263–64
Erysichthon: 253n.96
etiology: Callimachus' use of, 184, 286, 301. See also *Iambi*
Eudemus, 184–86
Euhemerus, 45–46, 80, 145, 147–48, 150, 184
eunuch. See *Galli*
Euphorbus, 146
Europa, in Moschus, 294
Euryalus, 252n.94
Euthydemus: central figure of *Iambus* 3, 233–34, 246; characterization of, 224, 242; imagery of encounter with, 207cn.15, 208cn.29, 238, 252; and potential evocation of Socrates, 237; venality of, 221, 226, 252
Exekias Cup: 132

fable: in Archilochus, 171–72; in Callimachus, 17, 19, 173–75; general, 152–53; in Hesiod, 170–71; in *Iambus 6,*

fable *(continued)*
290–91; as medium for literary criticism, 175, 198; and the Near Eastern tradition, 198–99; of the tortoise and the hare, 290–91. See also *Iambi* 2 and 4
fates. See *moirai*
figs, 58–59, 281
folk wisdom/humor, 93
fox, in *Iambus* 2, 182–83

gambros, 239–41
Galli, 243, 246
gender, fluidity of, in Latin Poetry and Callimachus, 242–43
genre: Callimachus' manipulation of, 192; one poet, one genre, 83–88. See also *polyeideia*
goddesses. *See under specific goddesses*
gods: as craftsmen 130–31; unresponsive, as *topos* of the iambic poet, 243. *See also under specific gods*
gold: associated with gods, 291; corrupting qualities of, in *Iambus* 12, 108–9cn.26, 232; fading value of, 139, 141; in Fr. 384 *(The Victory of Sosibius)*, 111cn.64. *See also under* Apollo
Graces, 249n.84, 290, 292
gymnasium, as locus for homoeroticism, 234–35, 255, 301. See also *paideia*

Hades, 59, 132
Hebe: birthday of, 120, 125, 132–33, 151; recurring presence in *Iambus* 12, 135; as reflection of poem's addressee, 128–29
Hecale 3, 124, 124n.12, 191n.63, 202n.80
Hecate, in *Iambus* 1, 50–52
Hellenistic poetry, 16, 80; aesthetics of, 125, 226, 230; and particular awareness of earlier literature, 90n.49; refashioning of Hipponax in, 35–36, 151
Hellenistic society: homoeroticism in, 225; poetic patronage in (*see* patronage)
Hephaestus, in *Iambus* 12, 125, 128, 133–34
Hera, in *Iambus* 12, 127–29, 132
Hermes: in Attic comedy, 301; in Callimachus, 300; in iambic poets, 71–72n.6, 300; in *Iambus* 9, 265, 300–3; *Perpheraios*, 297–98 (see also *Iambus* 7); as tutelary god of the gymnasium, 301. *See also under* Homeric hymns
Herodas, *Mimiambi* of, 3
Hesiod, 219; allusions to, in *Iambus* 13, 95–99. *See also* Perses
hetairoi/hetaireia, 3, 219
Hipponactean language, in *Iambus* 3, 223
Hipponactean persona, 143; voice of sage in *Iambus* 1, 146, 151, 189–90. *See also* poetic voice, Callimachus' adoption of a Hipponactean
Hipponax, 1–2, 5, 16–17, 19; aesthetic criticism in, 32–35, 146, 282; Bupalus in, 248 (*see also* Bupalus); Callimachus' evocation of, through choliambic meter, 21, 38, 60; and Clazomenae, 42n.33; ethical criticism in, 34, 248; as framing device in *Iambi* 1 and 13, 21, 61, 89–91; in Horace's *Epodes,* 10; in *Iambus* 1, 32, 35–48, 150–51; and *Iambus* 5, 251; invective of, 39–40; memorialization of, 283–84; as model for Callimachus' ecphrases, 281–82; as moral authority in Hellenistic epigram, 35–36; poetic voice of, 33, 33n.5; poverty in, 38, 227–8; role in *Iambus* 13, 7, 60, 82; scholarship on, 33; self-reference in, 37–38; use of foreign words in, 38n.20; use of sound imagery by, 42n.37
Homeric hymns: to Demeter 51, 132; to Dionysus, 132; to Hermes, 71n.6, 122, 131
Homeric *Margites*, 247n.74
homoeroticism: in Callimachus, 224–25, 233–42, 249; and paideutic relationship, 224–25, 249. *See also* gymnasium; *paideia*; *paiderasteia*
Horace, 16, 81; *Epodes* of, and the *Iambi*, 10, 13; *Satires* of, 10, 54
Horai. See Graces
Hymn 1, 40, 121–22, 127
Hymn 2, 89, 136–37, 142, 180
Hymn 3, 122
Hymn 4, 11, 100–2, 122–23, 180
Hymn 5, 40, 284, 294n.44
Hymn 6, 40, 243, 284, 294n.44

Iambe, 51
Iambi: and divine themes, 290n.34, 300–1; characteristic features of, 83, 146, 222–23, 259–60; general discussion of collection, 5–9, 265–67; opening lines in, 71, 91, 222, 290; paired, 8–9, 18–19; permeable border of frame and example in, 53, 146; structure of, 7–13. *See also* memorialization
iambic poetry: addresses one individual,

196; criticism in, 205, 252; general characteristics of archaic, 2, 58n82. *See also* abuse
Iambus 1: allusion to Hipponax in final extant section of, 55–56; apostrophe in, 51, 81; apparent catalogue of literati in, 48–49; contest of the Seven Sages in, 143–46; evocation of earlier era in, 222; first of five choliambic poems, 71; frame and dramatic structure of, 82; and *Iambus* 12, 104–5; and *Iambus* 13, 11–13, 16, 18, 96; —, treated in detail, 89–91; imagery of journey in, 76; imagery of writing in, 51–52, 57–58 ; invective in, 54; journey of Amphacles in, 149–51; narrative of Bathycles' death in, 146–48; outline of, 5; portrayal of Thales in, 150; *P. Oxy.* 1011 as source for, 3, 13, 22; and relationship to *Iambus* 2, 189–90; revelation of poem's internal audience in early lines of, 41–46; speaker's portrayal of crowd in, 49–50; uncertain number of lines of, 53; voice of opening lines in, 36–40, 47
Iambus 2: addressee of, 91; evocation of earlier era in, 222; extent of extant text of, 175; fable as medium for literary polemic in, 145; fable of, paralleled in *Aesopica*, 177; —, in Philo, 178–80; fable treated in *Iambi* 2 and 4, 16, 19, 152–53; and *Iambus* 1, 189–90; men of animal voice in, 182–89; opening lines of, 176–77; outline of, 5; *P. Oxy* 1011 as source for, 3, 154; role of the swan in, 180–82; scope of earlier scholarship on, 175–76
Iambus 3: addressee of, 91; conclusion of, 247–48; epigram, shared features with, 248–49, 250; *eromenos* of, 123, 237–38; and erotic epigram, 243–45, 249; ethical criticism in *Iambi* 3 and 5, 16–17, 19, 205, 235–36, 251–52; evocation of earlier era in, 222; foreign cult in, 242, 245–47; fragmentary opening section of, 223–25; and Hipponactean language, 251; homoerotic character of, 237, 241; and *Iambus* 5, 252; individual satire in, 76; opening line of, 222–23; outline of, 5–6; narrative of erotic rejection in, 233–34, 237, 241–42; play with Platonic *paideia* in, 237, 239; *P. Oxy.* 1011 as source for, 3, 206; role of divine in, 222; self-portrayal of the poet in, 226–27, 242–45; structure of, 221, 226
Iambus 4: addressee of, 91; agon of, 84, 190, 199; contrasting aesthetics in, 191–92, 202–3, 204; correspondence with fr. 229 Pf. *(Branchus),* 11, 191; correspondence with *Iambus* 1, 11, 194, 196–97; fable of, paralleled in *Aesopica*, 197; —, in Babylonian tale, 198; fable treated in *Iambi* 2 and 4, 16, 19, 145–46; identity of figures in frame of, 193–96; outline of, 6; *P. Oxy.* 1011 as source for, 3, 158; reference to Near Eastern origin of fable in, 199; role of the bramble in, 203–4; speech of the laurel in the agon of, 199–202; speech of the olive in the agon of, 202–3
Iambus 5: addressee of, 91; —, named in Diegesis, 186, 256; erotic metaphors in, 263–64; ethical criticism in *Iambi* 3 and 5, 16–17, 19, 205, 235–36, 251–52; first of three epodic poems, 5, 254–55; and Hipponax 118 W., 56n.77, 253–54; homoerotic character of, 195; and *Iambus* 1, 254, 257; and *Iambus* 3, 252, 264; imagery of schoolroom in, 57, 259, 261; meter of, 212, 255, 257; occasion of, 255–59; opening lines of, 260–63; oracular imagery in, 264; outline of, 6; satire in, 76, 82, 256–57; sources for, 212, 254
Iambus 6: addressee of, 91; craftsmanship as metaphor for poetry in, 95n.62; dialect of, 5, 288; epigrammatic conclusion of, 293–94; features of Callimachus' poetic style in, 290; and the *Iambi,* 265–67; and *Iambus* 5, 288; and *Iambus* 7, 288; and *Iambus* 9, 288; and *Iambus* 13, 289–90; meter of, 5, 17, 288; metatextual element in, 293; nature and significance of, 288–90; one of three poems on statuary, 19, 265–67, 288; outline of, 6; papyri source for, 5, 290; presence of fable in, 291; as *propemptikon*, 121, 289
Iambus 7: as aretalogy, 265, 296; and dedictory epigram, 286; detailed diegesis to, 14, 296–98; dialect of, 266, 288; discussion of dialect of, 295–96 (*see also* Doric *and* Aeolic); and the *Iambi*, 265–67; and *Iambus* 6, 288, 294–96, 298; and *Iambus* 9, 296; imagery of journeying in, 8, 267, 288; meter of, 5, 17, 288; one of three

Iambus 7 *(continued)*
poems on statuary, 8, 19, 265–67; opening lines of, 295–99, 298–99; outline of, 6; papyri source for, 5, 7, 272; speaker of, 91, 265, 267, 299–300; statue of, 8, 297–98
Iambus 8: addressee of, unclear, 91; as epinician, 11; meter of, 5; one extant line preserved of, 5; one of four *aitia*, 8; outline of, 6
Iambus 9: homoerotic character of, 303; and the *Iambi*, 265–67; and *Iambus* 7, 300; meter of, 5; one of three poems on statuary, 19, 265–67; one of four *aitia*, 8; outline of, 6; presence of Hermes in, 132n.28, 300–3; source for, 278; two lines preserved of, 300
Iambus 10: addressee of, unclear, 91; and *Iambus* 11, 8; meter of, 5 ; one of four *aitia*, 8; outline of, 6–7
Iambus 11: and *Iambus* 10, 8; meter of, 5; one of four *aitia*, 8; outline of, 7
Iambus 12: addressee of, 91; Apollo's soliloquy in, 134–42; apostrophe in, 134–35; concluding lines of, 143; correspondence with fr. 228 Pf. *(The Deification of Arsinoe),* 11; Cretan imagery in, 121–22, 143; gathering of deities in, 125–34; and *Iambus* 1, 18, 104–5; and *Iambus* 13, 143; meter of, 5; occasion of, 120–25; outline of, 7; *P. Mich.* inv. 4647 as source for, 14, 106; *P. Oxy.* 1011 as source for, 3, 106
Iambus 13: allusions to Hesiod in, 95–99; choliambic meter of, 7, 60; closure, as poem of, 4, 7, 11–13, 266n.3 (see also *Iambi* 14–17 [?]); critic's charge in, 74–81; delimitation of genre in, 82–85, 87–89; and *Iambus* 1, 11–13, 60–61, 72, 74, 82, 89–91, 96; and *Iambus* 4, 99–103; and *Iambus* 12, 143; Ion of Chios in, 84, 87–89, 91–95; opening lines of, 70–71; outline of, 7; and Plato's *Ion*, 85–89; poetic self-definition in, 60–61, 81–82, 99–103; *polyeideia* in, 13, 68cn.34, 83–85, 101, 103; *P. Oxy.* 1011 as source for, 3, 5, 62
Iambi 14–17(?), 4, 10–13
iambic trimeter, 5; alternating with ithyphallics, in *Iambus* 6, 268; —, *Iambus* 7, 272
initiation, poetic, 44
inspiration: in Callimachus, 44, 70, 74, 224, 247–48; divine vs. skill, in Plato's *Ion,* 83, 85; in Hellenistic poetry, 70n.2; in Hesiod, 96; poetic, generally, 78, 81, 99. *See also* Apollo; Muses
Ion of Chios, 7, 60, 65cn. 36, 66cn.43, 73, 84–89, 91–95, 97. *See also* variety
Ion of Ephesus, 85–86
Ionic (dialect), literary, 5, 63cn.18; of *Iambus* 1, 22; of *Iambus* 2, 154; of *Iambus* 3, 206; of *Iambus* 4, 158; of *Iambus* 5, 212; of *Iambus* 12, 106; of *Iambus* 13, 62. *See also* dialect
ithyphallic (meter), 5; alternating with iambic trimeters in *Iambus* 6, 268

journeys: to Ainos in *Iambus* 7, 6, 294; of Amphalces in the parable of Bathycles' cup, 149–51; of divine figures in Callimachus, 298n.51; not to Ephesus in *Iambus* 13, 12, 61, 76–77; figurative, to a collective Greek past, 147; general discussion of, in *Iambi*, 267; in Hipponax, 282; of *Iambi* 6 and 7 compared, 294; in *Iambi* 1 and 13 compared, 72, 76–77; in *Iambus* 13, 7, 72, 74, 76–77; of the nautilus in *Ep.* 5, 287; possible, in Apollonius Rhodius' fragments, 291; to the underworld, 11, 50n.60; from the underworld in *Iambus* 1, 59
Juvenal, 16, 262
juxtaposition: of Aesopic fable and scholarly Alexandria, 176–77, 183; in Callimachus, 58, 80, 104, 290–91, 296; of god and coward, 298; of high and low imagery, in Hipponax, 71. *See also* objects

katabasis. See under journeys

Latin poetry, 16, 262, 264; art object representing deity in, 296; gender confusion and marginality in, 242–43; and Mimnermus, 73n.10; and poverty, 226. See also poetry books; *servitium amoris*
Leandrius of Miletus, 144
legitimacy: *See* authority
Leon (acquaintance of Callimachus in *Iambus* 12), 121, 129
Leto, 99–102, 192
literacy, 46; allusions to the alphabet and writing, 51–52, 57, 259, 260–61; and Callimachus' contemporary Alexandria, 3, 255–56, 261; and education, 178; and physicality of the text, 230; and writing vs. song, 126n.14

literary criticism: in the agon in *Iambus* 4, 201; choliambic as medium for, 190; fables as medium for, 175, 178, 192, 198
love. *See* eros
"low": the laurel's use of, in *Iambus* 4, 200; the olive's use of, in *Iambus* 4, 202. *See also* objects
Lycambes, 74, 171, 219, 248, 252–53
Lydia, 66cn.47, 201, 292

madness: and the iambic poet, 7, 54, 75, 80–81; in *Iambus* 3, 242, 247
marginality, as theme of iambic poetry, 55, 227–28, 242
Meleager, 249n.81
Melecrites, 299n.57
memorialization, 1, 19, 36, 153; in the *Aetia*, 286; in *Iambus* 5, 264; in the statuary poems of Callimachus, 283, 286, 291–92
metanastic sages, 146n.62, 173
meter: alternating iambic trimeters and ithyphallics, in *Iambus* 6, 268; —, in *Iambus* 7, 272; archebulean, 11n.18; Callimachus' arrangement of, in the *Iambi*, 5, 266; catalectic choriambic pentameter, 11n.18; choliambic, and its evocation of Hipponax in *Iambi*, 21, 38, 60; —, alternating with iambic dimeter in *Iambus* 5, 212, 255, 257; fourteen syllable Euripidian, 11n.18; iambic trimeter, 17; in *Iambus* 13, 62; ithyphallics, 17; stichic choliambic, in *Iambus* 1, 22; —, in *Iambus* 2, 154; —, in *Iambus* 3, 206; —, in *Iambus* 4, 158 ; trochaic trimeter catalectic in *Iambus* 12, 106. *See also under specific meters*
Miletus: Bathycles' son's trip to, 149; Branchus' curing of the Milesians, 200; in Callimachus, 11, 11n.21; in Hipponax, 11, 57n.78
Mimnermus, 72–73; in Roman poetry, 73n.10
Mimnes, 34–35, 67cn.54–56, 73–74, 79, 281–82
Moirai (Fates), 125, 143
Moschus, 294
mothers, as panders, 237–38
Mouseion. *See* Alexandria, *Mouseion* of
Muses: in *Aetia*, 44; in *Iambus* 1, 44, 58; addressees of *Iambus* 13, 74, 95; appropriated by poet in *Iambus* 13, 70, 96, 98–99; conjectured presence in opening of *Iambus* 3, 206cn.2, 226; as figure of critic's charge in *Iambus* 13, 79; muselessness, 43n.38, 187; poet's resignation to in *Iambus* 3, 226, 247–48
Myso, 144

names, significant. *See* Euthydemus; Hermes Perpheraios
Neobule, 248
Nike, 292

objects: in Callimachus, 58, 280, 298; of humble nature in archaic iambic, 38, 58–59, 280–81, 290; speaking (see *oggetti parlanti*). *See also under* juxtaposition
obscene expression, in the *Iambi*, 115cn.42, 248, 301
Odysseus, 252n.94
oggetti parlanti, in *Iambi* 7, 9 and 11, 300
onomatopoeia, 46, 99. *See also* sound (harsh)
Ovid, *Amores*, 192

paiderasteia, 255
paideia, homoerotic, 225, 233–37; compared in *Iambi* 3, 5, and 9, 255; and terms of knowledge, 238–39
Palaimones, 299n.57
papyri, as sources for the *Iambi*, 3–4, 13–14; *Iambus* 1, 22; *Iambus* 2, 154 ; *Iambus* 3, 206; *Iambus* 4, 158; *Iambus* 5, 212; *Iambus* 6, 268; *Iambus* 7, 272; *Iambus* 9, 278; *Iambus* 12, 106; *Iambus* 13, 62
parrots, 185, 188–89
past: evocation of, in *Iambi* 1–3, 222; idealized, in *Iambus* 3, 237–38
patronage: in archaic Greece, 228; Hellenistic poetry, effect on, 228–31; in Theocr. *Idyll* 16, 230
Persephone, 125, 132
Perses, 219, 252n.94
Persius, 16
persona loquens, 60
Pheidias, 290–91, 293
philologoi, 30cn.3, 45–46
philosophoi, 30cn.3, 45–46
Philton, 184–86
Phoenix of Colophon, 3, 149–50
Pindar, 86n.39, 174–75; and patronage, 227–29, 231. See *Abbruchsformel*
Pittacus, 219

Plato: Callimachus' use of, 86n.36, 142, 233, 237, 239; *Ion,* 85–89; *Symposium,* 19, 86n.39, 235–36, 255
poeta doctus, 47
poetic voice: Alexandrian, 17, 47; Callimachus' adoption of a Hipponactean, 17–18, 37–40, 143; Callimachus' ambiguity of, 40, 46–47, 264; Callimachus' variable, 259–60; Callimachus' variety of, 173, 234, 243, 267, 299; complex, in *Iambus* 1, 37, 47, 53; and the divine in *Iambi* 3 and 13, 222; personal, and the poet as advisor, 219–20, 252–53, 262–63; Sappho's variety of, 234; of the suffering poet-*erastes* in *Iambus* 3, 225, 242. *See also under* animals
poetry books, 7–8
polyeideia: Apollo's song in *Iambus* 12 emblematic of, 143; Callimachus' defense of, 7, 12, 68cn.34, 84; as characteristic of Callimachus' *Iambi,* 9. See also under *Iambus* 13; Ion of Ephesus
Polyphemus, in Callim. *Ep.* 46, 78–79
Poseidon, 109cn.29, 129, 202
poverty: of the archaic poet, 226–28, 231, 251; of Callimachus in *Iambus* 3, 225, 232, 248; and the Hellenistic poet, 230–32; of the iambic poet, 58n.84; and the Roman poet, 226
praeceptor amoris, 234
Praxinoa, 51n.63
Priapea, 296
Priamel, 186
Prometheus, 177
propemptika, 121, 255, 289. See also *Iambus* 6
prostitute, Pindar's image of the poet as, 231–32
proverbs, in Callimachus, 209cn.39, 260
Ptolemy II Philadelphus, 100, 122–23, 134n.30, 150, 173

realism: of childhood, 124; evoked by human details, 133
recusatio, 76n.14
refashioning: of fable, 153, 174, 191–92; of genres, 1, 4, 36; of Hesiod, 98; of Hipponax (*see under* Hipponax); of iambic poetry, 251, 296, 300–1; of wisdom literature, 145

sailing, 149
Samothrace, 302. *See also* Cabiri
Sappho, 234; as a schoolteacher, 259
Sarapis, 45, 146, 148, 189–90; at Canopus, 291
satire, Roman, 58n.84, 264
Scamander, 299
scholars. *See* "academics"
schoolteachers: in *Iambus* 5, 6, 19, 76n.13, 82, 256, 259; low social status of, 261–62; *Suda*'s assertion about Callimachus' profession as a, 257, 259. *See also* Sappho
self-reference: in Callimachus, 53, 56, 81, 99–102, 122, 191–92, 194; in Hipponax, 37–38; and the resting place of Leto, 99–102, 192. *See also the individual Iambi*
servitium amoris, 250
Seven Sages, 144–46; sayings of, 173
sexual misbehavior. *See* censure
shame, public, in archaic Iambic poetry, 252
Simaetha, 162cn.74
Simonides, 86n.39, 174; and patronage, 227–32; *Tomb of* (*Aet.* fr. 64 Pf.), 284, 286
simos, 51n.62, 193–94
Solon, 75n.12, 91n.50, 97n.68
sophia, 138, 144n.54. *See also under* agon
sound (harsh), 42–43; as term of abuse against Callimachus' contemporaries, 174–75, 188–89. *See also* animals
statuary: anthropomorphism of, 292; of Apollo at Delos in *Aet.* fr. 114, 285–86; *Archilocheion,* 282–83; of Hera at Samos in *Aet.* frr. 100–101, 286; of "high" and "low" in *Iambus* 6 and 7 compared, 295; *Homereion,* 282; in the *Iambi* in general, 265–66, 288; of *Iambi* 6, 7, and 9 compared, 288; of *Iambus* 6 (*see* Zeus at Olympia); of *Iambus* 7, 6, 19, 288; ithyphallic Hermes in *Iambus* 9, 6, 265, 288; as object of criticism in Hipponax, 35, 281–82; of the Palladion in *Hymn* 5, 284–85
swans, and their songs, 141n.46, 180–82
swarms, poetic imagery of, 42, 49–50; in contrast with Bathycles' *eudaimonia,* 148; in contrast with "iconographized" Thales, 150
symposia, in *Iambus* 13, 62cn.1

teachers, on difference between a γραμματικός and a γραμματοδιδάσκαλος, 256n.105. *See also* education; schoolteacher; Seven Sages

techne, 134, 142, 290–91. *See also* craftsmanship
Telchines, 76n.14, 189
Thales, in *Iambus* 1, 145–46, 149–50
Theocritus, 249n.81; circulation of *Idylls* of, 13; *Epigram* [21], 283–84. *See also under* patronage
Theognidea, 219
Thersites, 218
Theseus, 203
tombs: of archaic poets, 282–83; in epigram, 293–94; Simonides', in *Aetia* fr. 64, 284, 286; "speaking," in *Iambus* 11, 7
tone/register, alternation in high and low in *Iambus* 4, 202. *See also* juxtaposition
Trojan horse, 298
Tyrrhenian: people, 302n.66; pirates, 131–32

variety: in dialect, 295–96; meter, genre 72. *See also* Ion of Chios; poetic voice; *polyeideia*
violence, imagery of in iambic poetry 55–57, 82. *See also* abuse
voice: *See* poetic voice

wasps, 50
weaving, 80n.27
wisdom literature, 145
wolves, 141–42

Zeus: in *Iambus* 2, 182–83; in *Iambus* 12, 108–9n.26, 127–29, 132; statue of, at Olympia in *Iambus* 6, 6, 288, 290